

You Shall Know that I am YHWH:

The Holiness Composition in the Book of Exodus

A Dissertation

Presented to the Faculty of

Asbury Theological Seminary

Wilmore, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree

Doctor in Philosophy in Biblical Studies

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Bill T. Arnold, Mentor

Dr. John A. Cook, Reader

By

Paavo Tucker

August 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Question of the Priestly Literature in the Pentateuch

Chapter 2: History of Research on the Priestly Literature and the Holiness Code

2.1. H, P^G, and P^S in the History of Research on the Priestly Material

2.1.1. The Priestly Materials from de Wette to Wellhausen

2.1.2. Martin Noth, Karl Elliger, and the Search for the End of P^G

2.1.3. P^G ending in the Sinai Pericope

2.1.4. H as a post-P Redaction or Supplement

2.1.5. The Holiness Code as an Integral Part of the Priestly Literature

2.2. Conclusions and Proposal on the History of Research

Chapter 3: Objections against the continuity of the Priestly Narrative and H

3. State of the Question

3.1. Different views of Land Ownership

3.2. The identity of Israel as the People of YHWH or Slaves of YHWH

3.3. Conceptions of the Covenant

3.4. Presence of Deuteronomistic Terminology

3.5. The Question of Profane vs. Sacred Slaughter

3.6. Passover Instructions in Exod 12 and Lev 23

3.7. Theological Differences

Chapter 4: Genesis 1:1–2:4a as "Holiness Preamble": Analysis of Genesis 1:1–2:4a

Chapter 5: The Holiness Composition in Exod 1-14: You shall know that I am YHWH

5.1. Introduction to the Priestly texts in Exod 1-14

5.2. The Priestly Base-layer in Exodus 1-14

5.2.1. Exodus 1-2

5.2.2. Exodus 6:2–7:7

5.2.3. Exodus 12

5.2.4. Exodus 14

5.3. The Function of the Priestly Material in its Context

5.4. The Holiness Code in Exod 1-14*

Chapter 6: The Holiness Composition in Exod 16-40: Keep my Sabbaths and Revere my Sanctuary

6.1. Defining the Priestly texts in Exod 16-40

6.2. Exodus 16

6.2.1. The Function of the Priestly Manna-Sabbath Narrative

6.2.2. The Function of Exodus 16 as Part of the Holiness Code

6.3. Exodus 19-40: The Holiness Code and the Sinai Texts Exodus 19-40

6.3.1. The Base Priestly Narrative in the Sinai Tabernacle Account

6.3.2. Exodus 24:15b-18a

6.3.3. Exodus 25:1-2, 8; 29:45-46

6.3.4. The Conclusion of the Tabernacle Account Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-34

6.3.5. The Sabbath texts of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 as part of the Priestly Narrative

6.3.5.1. On the Unity of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3

6.3.5.2. Exodus 31:12-17//35:1-3 as part of the Priestly Tabernacle Narrative

6.4. The Priestly base-layer in the Tabernacle account

6.5. The Base Priestly Narrative of the Sinai Tabernacle Account and its Function as Part of the Holiness Code

7. Conclusion

ABBREVIATIONS

*	Indicates that the verses marked with an asterisk may exclude a few verses or parts of verses within the range listed (e.g. 6:2–7:7* may exclude a few verses or portions of a verse from within this range)
H	Holiness Code (Lev 17-26) or material related to the Holiness Code
P ^G	Priestly <i>Grundschrift</i> narrative
P ^S	Later supplements to the Priestly narrative
LXX	Septuagint
MT	Masoretic Text
RP	Final Redactor of the Pentateuch

Chapter 1

1. Introduction

Since the classic identification of the Priestly writings in the Pentateuch by Theodore Nöldeke,¹ debate has ensued over the extent and purpose of these Priestly writings. According to the view popularized in the 19th century by August Klostermann, Abraham Kuenen, and Julius Wellhausen, the Holiness Code (H = Lev 17-26) was the earliest Priestly literature, followed by the Priestly narrative P^G (*Grund-schrift*), to which various laws were added as supplements labeled P^S.² This view was reversed in the 20th century by Karl Elliger, Israel Knohl, and Jacob Milgrom, who argued that the Holiness Code post-dates the Priestly narrative.³ Still other scholars, following David Hoffmann and Bernardus Eerdmans from the 19th century, reject the distinctions between H, P^G, and P^S, and contend for a unified understanding of the Priestly literature, as proposed recently by Erhard Blum and Andreas Ruwe.⁴

These different understandings of the Priestly literature revolve around a few unresolved questions. There is no agreement as to what constitutes the purpose and ending of the Priestly narrative P^G, especially whether its goal is the establishment of

¹ Theodore Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments* (Kiel: Schwes, 1869), 143-44.

² August Klostermann, "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," *ZLTK* 38 (1877): 401-445; Abraham Kuenen, *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds* (3 vols.; Leiden: 1861-65; English translation: *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch* [vol. 1, 2nd ed., trans. P. Wicksteed; London: MacMillan, 1886]); Julius Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (4th ed.; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963); *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels* (2nd ed.; Berlin: G. Reimer, 1883).

³ Karl Elliger, *Leviticus* (HAT 4; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1966), 14-20; Israel Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995); Jacob Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16* (AB 3A; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 13-15, 61-63; *Leviticus 17-22* (AB 3B; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 1349-55.

⁴ David Hoffmann, *Das Buch Leviticus* (vol 2.; Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1906), 1-8; Bernardus Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien IV: Das Buch Leviticus* (Giessen: Töpelmann, 1912), 84-86; Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch* (BZAW 189; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990); Andreas Ruwe, *'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'* (FAT 26; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999).

the cult at Sinai, or the occupation of the promised land.⁵ Correspondingly, how much legislative material is retained in the original P^G is also a matter of debate that depends on how the purpose of the narrative is viewed. With regards to the Holiness Code, the question of the internal development of the laws of Lev 17-26 and how these laws relate to the Priestly narratives and texts outside of Lev 17-26 such as Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46 that evince the same style and theology as Lev 17-26 remains a matter of debate. Was Lev 17-26 an originally independent law code inserted into the Priestly Sinai narrative as Wellhausen argued?⁶ Or is it a redactional supplement mediating the laws of the Book of the Covenant, Deuteronomy, and other Priestly laws?⁷ Are the texts outside of Lev 17-26 that evince the formal and theological characteristics of Lev 17-26, such as Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46, to be considered H texts,⁸ or are these P texts that H has imitated in Lev 17-26? What are valid criteria for determining what is H material outside of Lev 17-26?

This study will consider these problems through an analysis of the Priestly texts in Exodus and how they relate to the Holiness Code in Lev 17-26. It has long been noted that key Priestly texts in Exodus such as the revelation of the name YHWH and the covenant promises in Exod 6:2-8 and its continuation in the establishment of the tabernacle and the presence of God promised in 29:43-46 evince linguistic and theological parallels to the Holiness Code in Lev 17-26. Particularly these texts

⁵ Suggestions for the end of P^G range from Exod 29:45-46; 40; Lev 8-9, 16, to Deut 34 and Joshua. For an overview of recent proposals, see Christian Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung Erinnern: Zum Ende der Priestergrundschrift* (HBS 23; Freiburg: Herder, 2000), and Erich Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (ed. E. Zenger u.a.; 8th ed.; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008): 193-209.

⁶ So recently Klaus Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Leviticus 17-26: Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition, und Theologie* (BZAW 271; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999).

⁷ Recently Eckart Otto, "Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitgesetz Levitikus 17-26," in *Levitikus als Buch* (ed. H-J. Fabry and H-W. Jüngling, BBB 119; Berlin: Philo, 1999), 125-196; *Theologische Ethik des Alten Testaments* (ThW 3/2; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994), 233-256; Christophe Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch* (FAT 25; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007).

⁸ So Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 104-105; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1337-1344.

are closely linked to the characteristic features of H: divine address in first person, the refrain "I am YHWH," the covenant promise of YHWH and the identification of Israel as the people of YHWH, the Exodus formula, the presence of YHWH dwelling among Israel, demand for holiness, and continuation of the promises and blessings initiated in the Priestly creation account.⁹ This characteristic H material in Lev 17-26 structures the legislation into a law code, and situates the H legislation into the setting of the Priestly narratives at Sinai between the Exodus and entrance into the promised land, where it functions as the parenetic conclusion to the Sinai Torah.¹⁰ As I will argue as the thesis of this study, the foundational Priestly texts in Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46, and along with them the remaining Priestly narratives in Exodus that are considered as belonging to this same narrative sequence and typically assigned to P^G are of the same H strata as the characteristic H material in Lev 17-26, and thus the main Priestly narrative texts in Exodus are to be assigned to H. The same can be said of the Priestly texts in Gen 1:1–2:4a; 6-9; 17. Rather than being a beginning for a "P" narrative, these texts from Genesis are understood better as establishing the conditions for the concerns of the Holiness legislation.¹¹ Following the work of Blum and Ruwe, I will

⁹ The quintessential theology of the Holiness Code is expressed in the climactic exhortation of Lev 26, and similar texts that share these essential "H" characteristics within Lev 17-26, particularly the parenetic frames to the laws (Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 277-79; Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 150-51). Lev 17-26 is structured by the characteristic H material as a framework of parenetic statements in Lev 18:1-5, 24-30; 19:1-4; 20:7ff, 22-27; 22:9, 31-33; 25:18ff, 38, 42, 55; 26* (Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237-241; "Innerbiblische Exegese," 172-76).

¹⁰ Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237-241; "Innerbiblische Exegese," 172-76; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 397-99; Ruwe, *'Heiligkeitsetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 57-64.

¹¹ Several texts in Genesis have been assigned to H by various scholars, such as Gen 1:1–2:4a according to Milgrom ("HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception* [VTSup 93, eds. Rolf Rendtorff and Robert Kugler; Leiden: Brill, 2003], 33-39), Yairah Amit, ("הבריאָה וּלוח הקדושה" in *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* [ed. Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey Tigay; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997], 13-29), Alan Cooper and Bernard Goldstein ("The Development of the Priestly Calendars (I): The Daily Sacrifice and the Sabbath," *HUCA* 74 [2003]: 5), Edwin Firmage, ("Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," *JSOT* 82 [1999]: 110), and Bill T. Arnold ("Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," in *Let Us Go Up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday* [eds. I. Provan and M. J. Boda, VTSup 153; Leiden: Brill, 2012], 331-45). The portions of the Priestly material in Genesis 6-9* is proposed to be H by Arnold ("The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative (Genesis 6:9-9:29)," in *Windows to the Ancient World of the*

contend that the Priestly materials in Gen 1-Lev 26 form an internally consistent "composition" that develops the themes of creation, Sabbath, sanctuary, and covenant to their climactic expression in Lev 17-26. The early critics were correct in seeing the Priestly narratives as being composed "for the explication of the emergence of various legal conditions,"¹² but the laws that are founded in the Priestly narrative are best understood in light of H-laws of Lev 17-26. The foundational themes of the Priestly narrative find their culmination in the legal promulgation and ethical parenesis of H, calling for Israel to respond to Torah as the realization of the goal of creation, the divine promises, and the covenant of YHWH with Israel, in their reverence to creational order, the Sabbath, and the sanctuary, as expressed in holiness to YHWH. Therefore rather than being a "P-Komposition" as Blum argues, I propose that it is more fitting to see the Priestly narrative as an "H-composition," which has utilized various Priestly traditions in forming the composition, but whose main structuring themes of creation, Sabbath, covenants, and sanctuary are the determined features of H. The H-composition from creation to Sinai centers around the theme of the presence of God, which culminates in YHWH dwelling among Israel, and the implications this has for Israel's identity and ethics in the call to be holy.¹³

Thus what has previously in scholarship been considered the Priestly narrative P^G is better understood as an H-narrative that forms the backbone of the H-composition. This composition includes various portions of H narrative and legislation, and has integrated non-Priestly traditions (traditionally J or E), as well as other Priestly

Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus [eds. Bill T. Arnold, Nancy Erickson, and John Walton; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014], 13-41) and Angela Roskop-Erisman ("Mythologizing Exile: Life, Law, and Justice after the Flood," in *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus*, 108-109). Genesis 17 has been suggested to be an H composition by Arnold (*Genesis* [NCBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009], 167-174).

¹² "Zur Erläuterung des Entstehens jenes gesetzlichen Zustandes" (Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 108).

¹³ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 326-333.

traditions which do not evince the characteristic features of H, especially within the tabernacle materials in Exod 25-40, and cultic laws in Lev 1-16. This main H-composition has also been supplemented by legal traditions also from the school of H, but reflecting a later stage of legal development.

This study will continue in Chapter 2 with a history of research on the Priestly materials of the Pentateuch, with a focus on the relationship between the Priestly narratives and the laws of the Holiness Code. After mapping out the various positions in scholarship, I will locate my own proposal of an H-composition as it relates to the perspectives that have been developed.

In order for the thesis of an H-composition to be viable, the internal consistency of the Priestly narratives of Gen-Exod with the characteristic H material in Lev 17-26 needs to be demonstrated. Chapter 3 is a critique of the arguments for irreconcilable differences between P^G and H, as proposed by Wellhausen and earlier scholars, and recently by Alfred Cholewinski, Eckart Otto, Erich Zenger, Christophe Nihan, and Jean-Louis Ska.¹⁴ The proposed contradictions between P^G and H, such as different views of the promise of the land, the relationship between YHWH and Israel, covenant theology, and the supposed influence of Deuteronomic language in H but not in P^G will be shown to be insufficient for differentiating between P^G and H. The dissolving of proposed inconsistencies between P^G and H will open up the possibility for making a positive case for the P^G narratives being better understood as H narratives.

¹⁴ Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium* (AnBib 66; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976), 334-38; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237; Jean-Louis Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch* (Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006), 152-53; Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 173.

Chapter 4 will begin with an analysis of what is to be considered satisfactory criteria for determining the H-provenance of a text outside of Lev 17-26. Not only the use of language and phrases traditionally assigned to H is sufficient, but there should also be a demonstrable affinity with the theology and ethics of H, with a function to serve as a foundation for the H legislation in Lev 17-26. These criteria are illustrated in Gen 1:1–2:4a. The creation account in Genesis 1:1–2:4a is a "Holiness Preamble" that is not only linguistically tied to H, but also establishes the foundational conditions for H laws, especially introducing conditions for the Sabbath and festivals of Lev 23 into the world. The Priestly flood account in Gen 6-9 and the covenant with Abraham in Gen 17 develop the dynamics of the H-concept of the covenant which reaches its culminating expression in Lev 26. The analysis of key Priestly texts in Genesis showing their affinity and function in relation to H will establish the plausibility of considering the Priestly narrative from Exodus also as part of an H-composition.

Chapters 5 and 6 will continue the method applied to Priestly texts in Genesis in an examination of the Priestly texts in Exodus. Key Priestly texts in Exodus, such as Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46 have already been identified as having close linguistic and theological affinities to Lev 17-26 and have thus been assigned to H by Israel Knohl and Jacob Milgrom. The assignment of these texts to H however has not been largely accepted, due especially to the conception of a P^G narrative that would require Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46 as its pillars in the book of Exodus that many scholars hold to.¹⁵ Relinquishing the traditional notion of a P^G narrative however allows the possibility of seeing the Priestly narratives in Exodus as part of the Holiness Composition, which

¹⁵ Erhard Blum, "Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. Sarah Shectman and Joel Baden; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 34.

will be shown to be a fruitful understanding of the theology and function of the Priestly narratives in Exodus. The Priestly texts in Exodus develop the H themes of creation, covenant, Sabbath, and sanctuary, which can be understood as part of the Holiness Composition from Gen 1-Lev 26. The function of the H-composition to buttress the H legislation is seen in Exod 1-14, where YHWH reveals his name to Israel and redeems Israel from Egypt in a process of "new creation" that is initiated by remembering the covenant with the patriarchs. Exodus 6:2-8 is a central H text that links the Exodus with the patriarchal and creation narratives from Genesis. Exodus 16 is an important transitional hinge between the Exodus event and the Sinai laws through the wilderness tradition by connecting the H-motif of the recognition of YHWH with the motif of the **כבוד יהוה** which will play an important part in the Sinai narratives. Exodus 16 also describes the crucial event of Israel discovering the Sabbath in the wilderness as part of the H-design of introducing the Sabbath into the world as initiated at creation and culminating in Lev 23-25. Exodus 19-40 contain the account of the giving of the laws at Sinai and establishment of the sanctuary, with the H texts in Exod 25:8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3 structuring the entire account around the H-themes of creation, covenant, Sabbath and sanctuary. Exodus 25:8; 29:43-46 are H-texts that link various Priestly traditions of the sanctuary (**אהל מועד, משכן, כפרת**) under the rubric of the **מקדש** and interpret the sanctuary as the place where YHWH dwells among all Israel, as the foundation for the demand to holiness in the laws of Lev 17-26. Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3 bracket the non-Priestly account of the golden calf and renewal of the covenant in Exod 32-34, structuring the entire Sinai account according to the H concerns of the importance of Sabbath observance and reverence of the sanctuary to maintain the covenant relationship with YHWH (Lev 19:30; 26:2). The Priestly texts of Exodus depict the foundational event of the revela-

tion of YHWH to Israel and the liberation that enables Israel to become the people of God. This freedom and setting Israel apart from the nations places the ethical demands as inculcated in Lev 17-26 on Israel, where the laws are motivated repeatedly by the refrains "I am YHWH" and recollection of the liberation from Egypt. As will be shown with the H narratives in Genesis, the Exodus H-texts likewise serve as the foundations for ethical admonition in the Holiness legislation. The H texts also occur at key junctures in Exodus and serve as links connecting various traditions, such as Exod 6:2-8 connecting the patriarchal and Exodus narratives, Exod 16 connecting the Exodus and Sinai traditions, Exod 25:8-9; 29:42-46 synthesizing tabernacle traditions, and Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 structuring the tabernacle texts around the non-Priestly account of the golden calf in Exod 32-34.

Chapter 6 will summarize and conclude the study, pointing to further implications of this thesis for Pentateuchal research. Graphically, the conception of the Holiness Composition advocated for Gen-Exod-Lev can be portrayed as follows. The Holiness Composition texts on the left column have integrated Priestly and non-Priestly traditions and have accentuated the particular emphases of the Holiness Code:¹⁶

H-Composition texts	Priestly traditions	Non-Priestly traditions
Genesis		
Gen 1:1–2:4a: Creation of the world, Sabbath, festivals, be fruitful and multiply, image of God		
	Gen 5: Genealogies	Gen 2:4b-8:22 Primeval traditions
Gen 6-9*: Flood account, undoing of creation, establishing covenant		
	Gen 10: Genealogies	Gen 11-16: Ancestor traditions
Gen 17: Abrahamic covenant		

¹⁶ The non-Priestly traditions here refer to what is traditionally called J or E materials, which form a continuous narrative running parallel to the Priestly account. The Priestly traditions in the middle column have either been taken up and utilized by the Holiness Composition, particularly the Tabernacle materials in Exod 25-29*, or have been supplemented to the Holiness Composition, such as with the genealogies of Moses and Aaron in Exod 6:13-30, and the Tabernacle supplements in Ex 30-31 and 35-40. These post-Holiness Composition additions are identified with what scholars traditionally describe as P^s that form later legal supplements to the traditional P^G.

Gen 28:1-9*; 35:11-15: Blessings of Abraham given to Jacob		Gen 18-50: Ancestor traditions
Exodus		
	Exod 1:1-5: Genealogies	
Exod 1:7, 13-14: links to creation, Lev 25 slave laws		Exod 1:6, 8-2:23a Egypt and Moses traditions
Exod 2:23aβ-25: links to Genesis covenants		Exod 3-5: Call of Moses, conflict with Pharaoh
Exod 6:2–7:6: revelation of YHWH, promises of covenant	Exod 6:13-30: Genealogies of Aaron Exod 7:8-13, 19-20a, 21b-22; 8:1-3, 12-15; 9:8-12 Aaron vs. magicians wonder contest	Exod 7-11: non-Priestly plague traditions 12:21-27, 29-42: non-Priestly Passover account
Exod 12:1-14: H-Passover aligned with Lev 23:5 vv.15-18, 43-52 later stages of Passover/Unleavened Bread tradition from H-school		Exod 13: Unleavened Bread Exod 14: Non-Priestly sea miracle Exod 15: Song of the Sea Exod 16-18: Wilderness Traditions Exod 19-24: Sinai traditions
Exod 14*: H Sea Miracle, recognition of YHWH, new creation		
Exod 16*: Manna-Sabbath, recognition of YHWH		
Exod 19:1-2a; 24:15-18; 25:1-2, 8; Sinai Revelation: YHWH to dwell among Israel, revere the sanctuary and keep the Sabbath	Exod 25:9-29:42 Tabernacle and Priestly traditions	
Exod 29:43-46: YHWH to dwell among Israel as culmination of covenants and recognition motif	Exod 30-31: Priestly tabernacle traditions (added post-Holiness Composition)	
Exod 31:12-17: Sabbath as sign of the Sinai covenant		Exod 32-34: Golden Calf and Covenant Renewal traditions
Exod 35:1-3: Sabbath command initiating execution report, bracketing Exod 32-34		

Exod 35-40: post-Holiness Composition development of the Tabernacle execution report

Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-34:
Completion of Tabernacle as culmination of creation

Leviticus

Lev 1-16: Priestly ritual and purity traditions

Lev 17-26: Holiness Code

Chapter 2

History of Research

2.1. H, P^G, and P^S in the History of Research on the Priestly Material

2.1.1. The Priestly Materials from de Wette to Wellhausen

The origins of identifying Priestly materials in the Pentateuch is found in the works of Witter, Astruc, and Eichhorn in the 17th century, whose studies resulted in the first theories of source distinctions in the Pentateuch based on the divine names **אלהים** and **יהוה** in Gen 1-3.¹ The Priestly material was originally assigned to an *Elohist* due to the use of **אלהים** in Gen 1:1–2:4a. The question of the relationship between the narratives and the laws in the Priestly materials was first investigated by W.M.L. de Wette.² According to de Wette, the Priestly author wrote the national epic of the Hebrew theocracy to recount the origins and constitution of the people.³ The history of the world lays the foundations for the theocracy, whose laws emerge from creation.⁴ Thus for de Wette, there is a balance between law and history or narrative within the Priestly literature.⁵

In 1843 Heinrich Ewald's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* continued along these lines in his discussion of the "Great Book of the Origins," which is comprised of five sources, one of which is *Das Buch der Ursprünge* (= P).⁶ According to Ewald, this

¹ For an overview of 17th century scholarship, see J-L. Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 102-104.

² *Kritik der Israelischen Geschichte Erster Teil: Kritik der Mosaischen Geschichte* (Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1807).

³ *Ibid.*, 32.

⁴ So for example the Sabbath is deduced from the creation narrative in Gen 1:1–2:4, with the flood and Noah, the prohibition of blood consumption and the laws for vengeance emerge (Gen 9:4-6), and circumcision with the covenant of Gen 17 (*Ibid.*, 43, 47, 51).

⁵ Norbert Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy* (trans. Linda M. Maloney; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994), 137.

⁶ H. Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel* (Vol 1; 3rd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht,

book is focused on Levitical and Priestly interests.⁷ The goal of the work is to describe the history of the universe, the origins of the nation of Israel among other nations and its institutions and laws.⁸ The laws at Sinai were the high point of this presentation, and the origins and development of the laws from creation to the Mosaic era was the "fine strong thread" which holds the *Book of Origins* together, giving it its "deepest and loftiest interest."⁹ Once the sanctuary and sacrifices are established at Sinai, the narrative "attains its full dignity, and undertakes regularly to teach what rules must guide the conduct of men in this community...what is holy or unholy, clean or unclean, to the God indwelling in it," in Lev 11-27.¹⁰

K.H. Graf was the first to argue for a separation of narrative and law in the Priestly literature in his *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testament* in 1866.¹¹ Graf rejected the idea that the Priestly narrative of Genesis-Exodus came from the same author of the Priestly laws of Leviticus, but maintained that Priestly laws in narrative contexts such as the establishment of circumcision in Gen 17 were the basis for the later composition of the Priestly law collections.¹² Graf originally believed that the Elohist, comprising what was later called P and E, was older than the Jehovist, who in turn was presupposed by Deuteronomy.¹³ The Priestly laws established by Ezra con-

1864). The references here are from the english translation *The History of Israel* (trans. R. Martineau, 2nd ed.; London: Longmans, Green, & co., 1869). Ewald's *Buch der Ursprünge* roughly corresponds to P in the Pentateuch, though it also extended to 1 Kings 8 (Ewald, *History of Israel*, 92).

⁷ Ibid., 78.

⁸ Ibid., 78.

⁹ Ibid., 86.

¹⁰ Ibid., 88-89.

¹¹ K.H. Graf, *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments: Zwei historisch-kritischen Untersuchungen* (Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1866).

¹² Ibid., 93.

¹³ Ibid., 8. Graf initially disregarded the distinction that H. Hupfeld made within the Elohist material between a priestly *Urschrift*, and later *elohistischer Stücke* (Holzinger, *Einleitung in die Hexateuch* [Freiburg: Mohr, 1893], 62). For an outline of Hupfeld's *Urschrift* which runs from Gen 1 to Exod 24:8, see his *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung* (Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1853), 80-87. Prior to the distinction by Hupfeld, also Karl-David Ilgen had distinguished between two Elohist in Gen 37-50 (K.-D. Ilgen, *Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in*

tained diverse materials, with Lev 1-16 being a collection of sacrificial, priestly, and purity laws, and Lev 18-26 forming a collection of laws with a peculiar form and expressions with beginning (Lev 18:2-5) and concluding exhortations (Lev 26), which had been brought together from various older law collections by Ezekiel.¹⁴ Following criticism by Kuenen and Nöldeke against separating the early Elohist narrative from the exilic Priestly laws, Graf modified his position and accepted the distinction between an Elohist *Urschrift* and later Elohist fragments proposed by Hupfeld, and placed the Elohist *Urschrift* (=P) narrative post-Deuteronomy, understanding it as a revisionary redaction of the older Jehovistic source.¹⁵ Thus Graf laid the foundations for the understanding of the Priestly writings that would be developed further and popularized by Kuenen and Wellhausen.

Theodore Nöldeke's *Grundschrift* formed the parameters of what classically became known as the P source from Gen 1 to Deut 34,¹⁶ and his view was taken up and popularized by Wellhausen.¹⁷ The main purpose of the *Grundschrift* narrative is to establish the foundations for the cult at Sinai and other rituals such as the Sabbath and

ihrer Urgestalt, als Beytrag zur Berichtigung der Geschichte der Religion und Politik aus dem Hebräischen mit kritischen und erklärenden Anmerkungen, auch mancherley dazu gehörenden Abhandlungen, vol. 1: Die Urkunden der ersten Buchs von Moses [Halle: Hemmerde and Schwetschke, 1798], 393-94). Likewise August Knobel attempted to explain the unusual features in the Elohist *Grundschrift* which he considered the earliest source, which nevertheless had utilized other written sources (*Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua erklärt. Nebts einer Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua* [KEHAT 13; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1861], 489-599). After the Elohist, a "Rechtsbuch" (close to Hupfeld's second Elohist), a ספר הישר, and a "Kriegsbuch" were added, before Jehovist and Deuteronomic material. The *Kriegsbuch* contained texts such as Lev 17-20; 23:2ff, 18ff, 22, 39-44; 24:10-23; 25:18-22; and 26 (cf. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* [2nd ed., updated by A. Dillmann; KEHAT 12; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880], 533). Knobel's view was considered eccentric and not accepted by other scholars.

¹⁴ Graf, *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher*, 75-76, 81-83.

¹⁵ Holzinger, *Einleitung*, 65-66.

¹⁶ Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 143-44.

¹⁷ J. Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 61n1.

festivals in Gen 1:1–2:4a.¹⁸ The nature of the *Grundschrift* is to use narratives to inculcate (*einschärfen*) the laws by providing illustrations of them.¹⁹

Abraham Kuenen also objected to Graf's separation of the Priestly narratives and laws,²⁰ and rejected Wellhausen's distinction between the Priestly Q narrative (*quatour*) and the *Priesterkodex* (PC) which was comprised of Q and the Priestly laws.²¹ Kuenen himself introduced the *sigla* P¹, P², and P³, with P¹ being Lev 17-26 as the oldest priestly material, P² corresponding to Wellhausen's Q narrative, and P³ being various later supplements.²² According to Kuenen, P² was a "historico-legislative work" that had a "lively interest in religious ceremonies and usages" within narrative sections such as in Gen 2:1-3; 9:4; 17; Exod 12, and 16.²³ The instructions for the building of the tabernacle in Exod 25-29 originally had a brief report of the execution of the commands, which was expanded secondarily in Exod 35-40, Lev 1-8, before the original narrative continues in Lev 9-10, and again in Lev 16, with the laws in Lev 11-15 inserted in between.²⁴ According to Kuenen, Lev 17-26 belongs to P in its general form, but differs in language, style, and substance.²⁵ This "code" had an older stratum of priestly legislation as its basis, and was fused with later priestly ordinances

¹⁸ Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 9.

¹⁹ Ibid., 62. For example, Exod 16 and 35 illustrate the Sabbath, and Exod 12 the Passover, which are brought together in Lev 23 into an "coherent overview of all the feasts." Elsewhere he states, "Das Buch will gar nicht ein Geschichtswerk sein, sondern das Geschichtliche ist nur das Beiwerk, das Gesetzliche das Wesentliche. So ist die ganze Vorgeschichte kurz gefasst, zur Erläuterung des Entstehens jenes gesetzlichen Zustandes (108)."

²⁰ A. Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 170-73, 272-73, 288-98. The second edition contains extensive supplements and responses to scholarship between 1865 and 1885. Kuenen defends Nöldeke's view of the unity of the Priestly narrative and legislation (*The Religion of Israel*, 193).

²¹ A. Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 64-65. Kuenen notes that contrary to Wellhausen's proposal, Gen 1:28-30 is not a covenant as Wellhausen claimed, but a blessing.

²² Ibid., 64, 87.

²³ Ibid., 72, 81, 87, 298-302.

²⁴ Ibid., 73-82.

²⁵ Ibid., 87. The criteria for distinguishing between P¹ and P² within Lev 17-26 are based on original P¹ material being related in form and substance to Lev 26:3-45 (277n5). The parenetic exhortations of Lev 18:1-5, 24-30; 19:37; 20:22-27; 22:31-33 and 25:18-22 are from this P¹ material related to 26:3-45 (279n6).

when introduced into its present position, and was combined with fragments and modified in the style of P² and P³.²⁶ Kuenen also suggests that fragments of P¹ are found outside of Lev 17-26, where the characteristic "I am YHWH" or the demand for holiness are found, such as Exod 6:6-8; 12:12; 29:38-46; 31:12-14, and Lev 11:41-47.²⁷ P² contains various narratives and legislative supplements in Numbers, the death of Moses in Deut 32:48-52 and 34:1a, 7-9*, and continuing to Joshua 21.²⁸

In 1877 August Klostermann wrote an article refuting Graf's view of Ezekiel being the author of Lev 18-26, which section he called the "Holiness Code" (*Heiligkeitgesetz*).²⁹ According to Klostermann, the compiler of the Pentateuch took pieces of this law and inserted or reworked them, along with other laws, into appropriate locations in the narratives of Genesis-Numbers.³⁰

Julius Wellhausen developed the hypothesis of Graf further. According to Wellhausen, the Priestly material consisted of a *Grundschrift* narrative called Q.³¹ This narrative was expanded with legal supplements (P^s) into the *Priestercodex* PC,³² with the Q narrative also being subjected to editing. The third part of Wellhausen's Priestly material is an older Holiness Code Lev 17-26.³³ According to Wellhausen, in

²⁶ In his 2nd edition Kuenen incorporates the term *Heiligkeitgesetz* coined by August Klostermann in 1877, cf. Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 87-90, 275-76.

²⁷ Ibid., 278n5.

²⁸ Ibid., 91-103.

²⁹ August Klostermann, "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," 401-445; expanded in 1893 in "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," in *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte* (Leipzig: Böhne, 1893), 368-418. The following references are from the 1893 version.

³⁰ "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," 375-77. So for example Exod 6:6-8; 12:12; 29:38-46; 31:13ff; Lev 11:43-45; Num 3:12-13; 10:8-10; 15:38-41 are pieces broken off from the Holiness Code.

³¹ This symbol is based on Wellhausen's view of Q as containing four covenants ("*quatour*"; *Composition*, 1-2). The original kernel of the Q narrative is sparse in Genesis compared to JE, but in Exodus and following, Q begins to dominate, originally containing legislative material at Sinai from Exod 25-29; Lev 9, 10, and 16, before continuing again in the narrative in Numbers (*Composition*, 144-148).

³² Ibid., 184.

³³ Wellhausen follows Graf in considering Lev 17-26 an older law collection taken up into the Priestly Codex, which differs from Q in its similarities with Deuteronomy and Ezekiel (*Composition*,

Q everything in history is made to prepare for the laws of Moses, with history divided into covenants with Adam, Noah, and Abraham, leading up to the Mosaic covenant.³⁴ Thus from Gen 1, the world is created for the purpose of the Priestly Torah. The post-flood covenant and laws (Gen 9:1-17),³⁵ circumcision (Gen 17),³⁶ and the Sabbath legislation in the wilderness (Exod 16)³⁷ overwhelm the storyline, which reaches its true goal with the Priestly legislation at Sinai, where the Priestly laws expand the narrative to massive proportions.³⁸

Wellhausen's view quickly became normative, and in his 1893 *Einleitung in den Hexateuch*, Heinrich Holzinger can affirm that there is "complete agreement" that there are three layers within P: the priestly narrative (P^G), the older Holiness Code (P^H), and legislative additions (P^S).³⁹ According to Holzinger, P^G is a combination of law and narrative, whose purpose is to show the emergence of religious institutions in sacred antiquity.⁴⁰

149-150). It consists of earlier sources that have been edited into an independent collection with a religious-parenetic tone (*Composition*, 150-51, 169). Wellhausen was also responsible for decisively including Lev 17 in the collection, though this had already been suggested by Kuenen.

³⁴ *Prolegomena*, 332, 358-59.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, 328-29.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 360-61.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 374.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 363, 83-84. Cf. *Composition*, 134-48 for the growth of the Priestly legislation from its original kernel.

³⁹ Holzinger, *Einleitung*, 334. Despite its peculiarities, according to Holzinger the Holiness Code belongs to the circle of P (407-410). All of the P materials were produced in the same "priesterlichen Schule" (409-410).

⁴⁰ *Ibid.*, 335. Holzinger quotes here the work of Paul Wurster ("Zur Charakteristik und Geschichte des Priesterkodex und Heiligkeitgesetzes," *ZAW* 4 [1884]: 112-133). Rejecting attempts to excise the legislative material from the P^G narrative, Wurster argues that the purpose of the Q narrative (P^G) as an *Offenbarungsgeschichte* is to show the historical emergence of religious practices such as the Sabbath (Gen 2:2-3; Exod 16), circumcision (Gen 17), and the Passover (Exod 12), prior to Sinai and the establishment of the Temple cult, in order to support religious practices for exiles (127-28).

2.1.2 Martin Noth, Karl Elliger, and the Search for the End of P^G

Following the classic expression of the H/P^G/P^S distinctions by Wellhausen, studies of the Priestly material focused on finding the original ending of P^G and on the formation of the Holiness Code. Martin Noth and Karl Elliger were decisive in developments in the understanding of the P^G narrative.⁴¹ Noth proposed that Deuteronomy was to be broken off from the Pentateuch as an introduction to the Deuteronomistic History.⁴² The Pentateuchal sources including P^G did not continue into Joshua, as P^G had no interest in the conquest since the main focus of the narrative is on the Sinai cult.⁴³ P^G nevertheless extends beyond Sinai to the death of Moses (Deut 34:1aa, 7-9) due to its faithful mirroring of earlier traditions.⁴⁴ The Pentateuchal redactor used P^G as the narrative framework to which older traditions were added, but omitted from P^G what originally followed the death of Moses.⁴⁵ P^G was originally purely a narrative work, and the symbol P^S should be reserved for texts that were supplemented to the independent P narrative. The P^G narrative itself has taken up traditions and sources which it integrated without smoothing over all of the irregularities.⁴⁶ Noth did not

⁴¹ M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948); English translation: *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions* (trans. B. Anderson; Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972); Karl Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung," *ZTK* 49 (1952): 121-143.

⁴² M. Noth, *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien* (Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft: Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 18, 1943), 43-266; (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Max Niemeyer: 1957); English translation of 2nd edition: *The Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSup 15; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

⁴³ M. Noth, *Das Buch Josua* (HAT 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938), 8-11; *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 8-19.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 11-12, 16.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 10-11. Noth rejected Gerhard von Rad's solution to the problem of unevenness in the narrative. Von Rad postulated two parallel narrative strands of P^A and P^B within P, as well as argued for the use of various sources by P such as a *Toledot* book (*Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch literarisch und theologisch gewertet* [Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1934], 160-61). Von Rad opposed the views of P. Volz and M. Löhr, who questioned the independence of the P narrative and argued for the fragmentary and supplementary nature of the priestly materials (P. Volz, "P ist kein Erzähler," in *Der Elohist als Erzähler, ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?* (eds. P. Volz and W. Rudolph; BZAW 63 [Gießen: Töpelmann, 1933]: 135-142; M. Löhr, *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem I: Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis* [BZAW 38; Gießen: Töpelmann, 1924], 1-2, 29-32). According to von Rad, the main

make a positive case as to why P^G would have ended with the death of Moses, beyond postulating that the original ending had been lost.

Karl Elliger took up the argument for an ending of P^G in Deut 34, but gave a positive explanation as to why it would end outside the land.⁴⁷ The high point of the narrative is the promise of the land to the patriarchs, which remains intentionally unfulfilled at the end of P^G.⁴⁸ The ultimate goal remains always in the future, as the book of Numbers and Deut 34:1, 7-9 tells the story of the failure of the leadership and the people to reach the goal.⁴⁹ Elliger interprets P^G in an exilic context, and understands Moses' dying glimpse of the land as a symbol of hope for the exiles to return home.⁵⁰

Frank Moore Cross also argued for the end of P^G with the death of Moses.⁵¹ For Cross, P^G constitutes a system of covenants, with the creation blessing of fruitfulness and multiplying (Gen 1:28) associated with the Noahic (Gen 9:7), Abrahamic (Gen 17:6), and Mosaic (Lev 26:9) covenants. This blessing formula is linked to the promise of the land and to Israel multiplying in the land, as seen from the peroration of the covenant in Lev 26:9.⁵² Each covenant is accompanied by a sign: the rainbow, circumcision, and the Sabbath.⁵³ The covenant formularies at Sinai begin with Exod 6:2-8 and extend to the closing exhortation of blessings and curses in Lev 26:3-45,

distinctions between P^A and P^B are in Numbers and Joshua, where there are divergent views of the priesthood, with P^A supporting Levitical priesthood, and P^B elevating the Aaronides (162-62). This criteria is not applicable in Gen-Exod, where the distinction is based more on style: The style of P^A follows the simplicity of JE, and is less theologically burdened and thus a livelier narrative, whereas P^B tends to be more complex and detail-oriented (163-64). For von Rad the cult, though important, is not the primary theme of P, but is only one of many concerns (185).

⁴⁷ Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 121-143.

⁴⁸ As noted by Elliger, P^G focuses on the land of Canaan, whereas cultic interests are peripheral outside of the Sinai narratives in Exod 25-Lev 10 (Ibid., 138).

⁴⁹ Ibid., 135.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 140-143.

⁵¹ F.M. Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), 320.

⁵² Ibid., 296.

⁵³ Ibid., 296.

which chapter Cross understands as H material reworked by P.⁵⁴ In between, P presupposes the non-P covenant ceremony of Exod 24, for which the Sabbath in Exod 31:13-17 functions as the sign of the covenant, and Exod 29:45-46 expresses the central benefit of the covenant of YHWH dwelling (שכן) in the midst of Israel, which is reaffirmed in Lev 26:11-13. P^G evinces gaps and omissions that indicate it is a redactional layer that never existed as an independent narrative apart from the JE traditions.⁵⁵

Following Noth and Elliger, it became firmly established that P^G does not continue into Joshua, and Elliger's understanding of the narrative as intentionally open-ended was largely accepted.⁵⁶ The next significant turning point in P^G research was Lothar Perlitt's 1988 article "Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?"⁵⁷ Perlitt argued that the Priestly portions of Deut 34:1a, 7-9 depend on what he considered post-P^G texts in

⁵⁴ Ibid., 297.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 305-306.

⁵⁶ See Frevel, *Mit Blick auf Das Land*, 29-42. Exceptions are Joseph Blenkinsopp, Norbert Lohfink, Horst Seebaß, and Enzo Cortese, who argue that P^G continues into Joshua. J. Blenkinsopp's article "The Structure of P," argues against Noth that P does have an interest in the land of Canaan. Blenkinsopp takes the repeated concluding formula in Gen 2:1, Exod 39:32, and Josh 19:51 (each with the root כלל) as forming a tripartite division of the Priestly narrative into the categories of creation, sanctuary, and establishment of sanctuary and division of the land (CBQ 38 [1976], 275-292; cf. *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible* [ABRL; New York: Doubleday, 1992], 237-39). Blenkinsopp does not consider Lev 17-26 to be a distinct document that existed apart from Leviticus and the P corpus of which it is now a part (Ibid., 224). Norbert Lohfink likewise suggested that P^G continues into Joshua, with Num 32:22, 29, and Josh 18:1 and 19:51 providing a fulfillment of the promise from Gen 1:28 of the land being subdued (כבש) and the completion of the division of the land (Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," 145n29-30). Also contending for P^G in Joshua is Horst Seebaß, who argues that there is a P^G land division in Josh 18:1,3,4,6b, 8a,9*,10a ("Josua," BN 28 [1985]: 56-61), and Philippe Guillaume (*Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18* [LHBOT 391; London: T&T Clark, 2009], 157-63). For Guillaume, the themes of land and Sabbatical calendar are central to P^G, thus including texts such as Lev 23 and 25 (174). The cult is insignificant for P^G (only Exod 25:1-2; 35:22-23*, 25; 36:8-13; 40:17,34b; Lev 16* are considered part of P^G for Guillaume from between Exod 25-Lev 16; 194-95). David Carr also considers that key P^G texts such as Exod 6:8 point to the land, and suggests that "some sort of P source may well have included a land-possession narrative" as a counterpart to the non-P Hexateuch (*The Formation of the Hebrew Bible* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011], 296-97).

⁵⁷ L. Perlitt, "Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?" ZAW 100.3 (1988): 65-88. Perlitt's view was further supported by T. Pola, who argued that the traditional P passages in Deut 1:3; 32:48-52, and 34:7a, 8 are a frame that identifies the day in which Moses dies, thus forming Deuteronomy into a testament of Moses, with no connection to the Tetrateuchal Priestly literature (*Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von P^G* [WMANT 70; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1995], 13-14).

Numbers such as 27:12-23, and evince a post-P^G mixture of Priestly and Deuteronom-ic language, and thus cannot be the conclusion to the original P^G. In Perlitt's view, the P^G narrative is not concerned about the land of Canaan, but only with the Sinai cult.⁵⁸

The tendency to cut back the ending of P^G continued in the next decade. A few scholars such as Christian Frevel, Ludwig Schmidt, Peter Weimar, Christian Macholz, and Joel Baden contend for the traditional ending of P^G in Deut 34,⁵⁹ whereas Perlitt, Jean-Louis Ska, Bernd Janowski, and Erhard Blum argue for an ending of P^G in the book of Numbers,⁶⁰ but increasingly scholars seek the conclusion to the original P^G in the Sinai pericope between Exod 25-Lev 16.

2.1.3 P^G ending in the Sinai Pericope:

Several scholars argue for P^G extending into the narrative portions of Leviticus. According to Matthias Köckert, the establishment of the cult and the system of atonement are essential for restoring the presence of God in P^G, and thus Lev 16 should be considered the climactic end of P^G.⁶¹ Köckert is followed by Christophe Ni-han, who argues that the Priestly narrative from Gen 1-Lev 16 follows the traditional ancient Near Eastern literary pattern that combines a creation account with victory

⁵⁸ Perlitt, "Priesterschrift," 86-87.

⁵⁹ Cf. Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 349-387; P. Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (FAT 56; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 16-17; L. Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift* (BZAW 214; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993), 257-261; C. Macholz, *Israel und das Land* (Habilitationsschrift; Heidelberg, 1969), 77-88; J. Baden, *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 176.

⁶⁰ For Numbers 27:12-14, see Perlitt, "Priesterschrift," 87-88; Erhard Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 227. According to Ska, P^G in Num 13-14*, 20:1-13 develop the issue of why Israel did not enter into the land, and Num 20:22-29 and 27* raise the connected question of the succession of Moses and Aaron, who will not enter the land (*Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 148-51). Bernd Janowski mentions as P^G texts Num 10:11-12*; 20:1*, 22b; and possibly Deut 34:9, though supplied with a question mark ("Tempel und Schöpfung: Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption," in *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments* [Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993], 224-25).

⁶¹ M. Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart: Studien zum Verständnis des Gesetzes im Alten Testament* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 104-106.

over enemies and the building of a temple.⁶² The day of atonement ritual in Lev 16 functions as a culmination of the restoration of the presence of God, and forms the climactic ending of P^G.⁶³ Erich Zenger considers the theophany in Lev 9:23-24 as the end of P^G and the climax of the Priestly founding history aimed at establishing the cult. For Zenger, the cult expresses the fulfillment of the promise of God's presence in the midst of the people (Gen 17:7-8; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46), and also is the fulfillment of the promise of the land to the patriarchs.⁶⁴ Thomas Römer also advocates for an ending of P^G in Leviticus, either in Lev 9 or 16.⁶⁵ Thomas Pola, Reinhard Kratz, and Albert de Pury see the ending of P^G at the completion of the construction of the Tabernacle in Exod 40, which forms an *inclusio* with the completion of creation in Gen 1:1–2:4a.⁶⁶ The most limited extent of P^G is proposed by Eckart Otto, for whom Exod 29:43-46 forms the conclusion to a P^G that establishes the presence of God amidst Israel at Sinai and the inauguration of the Aaronic priesthood and cult.⁶⁷

This survey of proposed endings for P^G has shown that scholars tend to focus on either the theme of the land or the cult as central to P^G, which emphasis then coincides with what is understood as the original ending of P^G. At this point we will look at how the Holiness Code has been understood in relation to P^G, before drawing preliminary conclusions from the history of research on the Priestly materials.

⁶² Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 61.

⁶³ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 379-382.

⁶⁴ Erich Zenger, "Das priesters(chrift)liche Werk (P)," 189-214.

⁶⁵ T. Römer, "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. Sarah Shectman and Joel Baden; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 160.

⁶⁶ T. Pola, *Die Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 309, 325; R. Kratz, *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament* (London: T&T Clark, 2005), 243; Albert de Pury, "Pg as the Absolute Beginning," in *Les Dernières Rédactions du Pentateuque, de L'Hexateuque, et de L'Ennéateuque* (eds. T. Römer and K. Schmid; BETL 203; Leuven: University Press, 2007), 111.

⁶⁷ E. Otto, "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," *TRu* 62 (1997): 40-41.

2.2.1 The Formation of the Holiness Code and the Priestly Narrative

In the earliest studies on the Priestly texts of the Pentateuch, it was common to see the Holiness Code as part of the main Priestly narrative, such as with Ewald, who considered Lev 11-27 part of his *Book of Origins*,⁶⁸ and Nöldeke, who considered Lev 1:1-26:2 as belonging to his P^G.⁶⁹ Starting with Graf however, Lev 18-26 was considered a *Besonderes Buch* separate from the Priestly narrative.⁷⁰

With the works of Klostermann, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, it became commonly accepted that Lev 17-26 represents a pre-Priestly law code formed by a single redactor, which was integrated into the other Priestly materials.⁷¹ A few scholars contested this developing consensus. August Dillmann considered Lev 17-26, which he called "S" for Sinaitic laws, as composed of different sources that lack internal order and do not form a unified law code.⁷² David Hoffmann also argued against the separation between P^G and H, since traces of P^G are found throughout Lev 18-27, and H texts are found outside of Lev 18-27, indicating that there is not a substantive distinc-

⁶⁸ Ewald, *The History of Israel*, 88-89.

⁶⁹ Nöldeke, *Untersuchung*, 144.

⁷⁰ Graf, *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher*, 75-76, 81-82.

⁷¹ This view is summarized by Holzinger's *Einleitung* in 1893 as the commonly accepted view at his time (*Einleitung*, 406-411). At this stage, Bruno Baentsch shifted attention to the redactional formation of earlier collections within Lev 17-26 (*Das Heiligkeitgesetz Lev. XVII-XXVI: Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung* [Erfurt: Güther, 1893]; *Exodus-Leviticus* [HKAT 2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1903]). For Baentsch, H was formed from a combination of earlier law collections: H1, which comprised Lev 18-20; 23-25*, H2 from Lev 21-22, and H3, which combined H1 and H2, and added Lev 17 and 26 from pre-existing materials (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, 69-71). Lev 23:1-8, 23-38 and 24:1-14, 23 were added by P, before a Pentateuchal redactor (RP) placed the whole collection into P and added various P retouches (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, 69). For Alfred Bertholet, Lev 17-26 formed an independent section whose kernel H is older than P^G (*Leviticus Erklärt* [KHC III; Tübingen & Leipzig: Mohr, 1901], ix). According to Bertholet, Lev 17-26 was combined from twelve different collections of laws and the concluding parenthesis 26:3-45, which was taken up and edited by a P redactor (x). Some scholars such as Louis Horst still maintained that Ezekiel was involved as the redactor of Lev 17-26 (*Leviticus XVII-XXVI und Hezekiel: eine Beitrag zur Pentateuchkritik* [Colmar: Barth, 1881], 50, 52, 86).

⁷² Dillmann calls P^G source A, and the Holiness Code S for Sinaitic laws (A. Dillmann, *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium, und Josua* [2nd ed.; KEH; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886], 632, 636-44; Dillmann and V. Ryssel, *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus* [3rd ed.; KEH 12; Leipzig: Hirzel, 1897], 582-83).

tion between P^G and H.⁷³ Bernardus Eerdmans contested the independence of Lev 17-26 from the rest of Leviticus. Eerdmans argued that Lev 17 is not a fitting beginning for an independent law code, that Lev 17-26 is comprised of groups of originally independent and partially parallel laws, and that the references to holiness, which are not peculiar to the laws in "H," are not found in Lev 17, 18, 23-26, which makes the label of a "Holiness Code" unfitting for these chapters.⁷⁴ Siegfried Kähler also argued against the view of Lev 17-26 as an independent law code, due to its diverse addressees (priests, Israelites), situations (the camp, Sinai, temple, land), and content, and the lack of an overarching internal organizing principle.⁷⁵ Despite the objections of Dillmann, Hoffmann, Eerdmans, and Kähler, the majority of scholars followed the Wellhausen-Kuenen view of Lev 17-26 as an independent law code that originated after Deuteronomy and before P^G.

Following Albrecht Alt's essays on form criticism and Israelite law and Gerhard von Rad's essays on form criticism of the Holiness Code, several scholars shifted their attentions to form criticism of Lev 17-26.⁷⁶ This phase of research combined literary criticism with form criticism, postulating literary developments of the laws based on formal differences.⁷⁷ Henning Graf Reventlow proposed that the Holiness

⁷³ Hoffmann, *Das Buch Leviticus II*, 1-8.

⁷⁴ Eerdmans, *Alttestamentliche Studien IV*, 84-85.

⁷⁵ S. Kähler, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Lev 17-26: Eine literarkritische Untersuchung* (Königsberg: Kümmel, 1929), 11, 61.

⁷⁶ Alt, *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1934); ET: "The Origins of Israelite Law," in Albrecht Alt, *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion* (trans. R.A. Wilson; Oxford: Blackwell, 1966), 79-132; G. von Rad, *Deuteronomium-Studien* (FRLANT 58; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1947); ET: *Studies in Deuteronomy* (trans. D.M.G. Stalker; SBT 9; London: SCM Press, 1953), 25-36. According to von Rad, the laws of Lev 17-26 had their origins as oral instruction given by Levites (31). Karlheinz Rabast briefly investigated the apodictic laws of Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code (*Das apodiktische Recht im Deuteronomium und im Heiligkeitgesetz* [Berlin: Heimatdienstverlag, 1949]). Walter Kornfeld analyzed the prescriptions in Lev 18 and 20, though he also proposed an overall view of the development of the laws of Lev 17-26, which he considered an independent law book which does not however stand out strongly from its surroundings (*Studien zum Heiligkeitgesetz* [Vienna: Herder, 1952], 7-12, 135-38).

⁷⁷ For L. Elliott-Binns, the formal criteria of H as "terse and compact" and hortatory, in comparison with P as "stereotyped, measured, and prosaic" is a decisive distinction between them

Code came from the liturgy of a pre-exilic covenant festival.⁷⁸ Rudolf Kilian contended that various parts of H such as Lev 17, 18, and 19 represent ancient materials utilized by the later Holiness Code.⁷⁹ These collections were combined by what Kilian calls an "Ru" redactor into an Ur-Holiness Code, followed by an exilic "Rh" redaction adding parenthetic admonitions, the festival calendar, and the conclusion in Lev 26*, before Priestly additions such as Lev 17 were made.⁸⁰ Christian Feucht also investigated H from a form-critical perspective, arguing that two originally independent law collections, H1 (Lev 18-23*) and H2 (Lev 25-26) were combined to form the Holiness Code.⁸¹ For the most part, scholars maintained the original independence of a pre-P Holiness Code, but the focus of research shifted away from form criticism to literary criticism in the following decades.

2.2.2.1 Karl Elliger, Israel Knohl, Jacob Milgrom, Alfred Cholewinski, Eckart Otto, Christophe Nihan: H as a post-P Redaction or Supplement

A decisive turning point in research on the Holiness Code came with Karl Elliger in the mid 20th century.⁸² Elliger conceived of H from the start as a series of post-P redactional expansions added to the P^G narrative in order to supplement the cultic P^G Sinai laws with ethical material.⁸³ The basic form Ph¹ was mainly a collector

("Some Problems of the Holiness Code," *ZAW* 67 [1955]: 28).

⁷⁸ H.G. Reventlow, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz: formgeschichtlich untersucht* (WMANT 6; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961), 30, 162-63.

⁷⁹ R. Kilian, *Literarkritische und Formgeschichtliche untersuchung des Heiligkeitgesetz* (BBB 19; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1963), 12, 27, 60.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 169.

⁸¹ Christian Feucht, *Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitgesetz* (TA 20; Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964), 66-73. Lev 17, 23*, and 24 did not belong to the original Holiness Code (64).

⁸² First in an article in 1952 (Karl Elliger, "Heiligkeitgesetz," in *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* [7 vols.; ed. Kurt Galling; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957-65], 3:175-76), and in his 1966 commentary on *Leviticus*, 14-20.

⁸³ Elliger, *Leviticus*, 16.

of older laws, comprising Lev 17-19*; 25-26*. Ph² redacted Ph¹ and added its own laws in Lev 20; 21:1-15, which Ph³ expanded with 21:16-24; 22:17-22,25b and 23*, before Ph⁴ finally inserted 22:1-16, 26-30; 24:1-9, 10-22 and reworked the festival calendar.⁸⁴

Elliger's thesis of a post-P Holiness Code initially was not accepted, as a few years later Winfried Thiel still considered an independent pre-P Holiness Code as an "inalienable result of scholarship."⁸⁵ With the adoption of Elliger's views by Alfred Cholewinski however, the post-P understanding of H became mainstream in German scholarship. Cholewinski saw Lev 17-26 as consisting of small collections of laws that were added to P in six redactional stages.⁸⁶ According to Cholewinski, the Holiness Code came from a circle of reform priests in Jerusalem, who corrected and modified the views of P and Deuteronomy.⁸⁷ This view became dominant in German scholarship, and is the starting point for studies by Eckart Otto, Klaus Grünwaldt, and Christophe Nihan. Otto argued in a series of studies that the Holiness Code seeks to mediate the legal hermeneutics of the Priestly laws from Sinai with the CC laws and D traditions from Moab as part of the final stage of the formation of the Pentateuch.⁸⁸ The tensions in the text result from the use of P, CC, and D materials that are mediat-

⁸⁴ Elliger, *Leviticus*, 17-19.

⁸⁵ Thiel, "Erwägungen zum Alter des Heiligkeitgesetzes," *ZAW* 81 (1969): 41. According to Thiel, the Holiness Code is divided into ancient laws, the H style parenthesis, and characteristic phrases that redacted together the earlier laws and which reflect a pre-Priestly deuteronomistic style of preaching (70), and the P redaction which located H in the Priestly narrative at Sinai (44-45).

⁸⁶ Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*, 131-41.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 338. Especially the concepts of centralization, festivals, and redemption/release laws in Lev 17, 23, 25 modify the Deuteronomistic views in Deut 12, 15, and 16 (*Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*, 145-251).

⁸⁸ E. Otto, "Innerbiblische Exegese," 125-196; *Theologische Ethik*, 233-256; "Forschungen zur Priesterschaft," 50; "The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. S. Shectman and J. Baden; *AThANT* 95; Zurich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009): 135-56. Reinhard Achenbach is also in agreement with Otto in seeing H as representing the mediating hermeneutics of the Pentateuchal Redaction ("Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen des Numeribuches im Horizont der Pentateuchredaktion," in *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense LV-The Books of Leviticus and Numbers* (ed. T. Römer; *BETHL* 215; Leuven: Peeters, 2008), 155.

ed through *Innerbiblische Exegese* and structured by a redactional framework in Lev 18:1-5, 24-30; 19:1-4; 20:7ff, 22-27; 22:9,31-33; 25:18ff, 38, 42a, 55; 26*. ⁸⁹ Similarly according to Klaus Grünwaldt, H modifies traditions from P, CC, D, the prophets, Psalms, and wisdom literature, though Grünwaldt contends for the independence of the Holiness Code. ⁹⁰ Grünwaldt distinguishes between the redaction and the received traditions in order to discern the intentions behind the formation of the Holiness Code. ⁹¹ H has utilized various traditions and framed them with parenesis in order to form a new law code for life in the post-exilic community. ⁹² H was then added into the Sinai pericope by a Priestly redactor who desired to emphasize ethics in addition to the cult. Christophe Nihan's study of H argues that it is a supplementary to the Priestly materials and reflects mediating legal exegesis of CC, D, and P laws, which intends to supplement P legislation from Lev 1-16, and also to revise the theology of P. ⁹³ Lev 17-26 is a post-Priestly redefinition of the meaning of Israel's holiness through the interpretation of earlier legal traditions, which abolishes P's distinction between priests and community and complements the sacrificial cult of P with the concept of sanctification through observance of the totality of Torah. ⁹⁴ The H editorial activity extended to supplements to P in Gen 17:14; Exod 12:14-20, 43-49; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; Lev 3:17; 7:22-27 (28-36?); 11:43-45; 16:29-34a. ⁹⁵ By its positioning between the laws in Exod 20-23 and Deuteronomy, H also functions as a hermeneutical pro-

⁸⁹ Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237.

⁹⁰ K. Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz*, 130, 375-77. Grünwaldt sees H as an independent unity originally not intended for insertion into the Pentateuch. Therefore he considers the narrative framework that integrates Lev 17-26 into P as secondary, for which he is critiqued by R. Achenbach, ("Das Heiligkeitgesetz im nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch. Zu einem Buch von Klaus Grünwaldt," *ZABR* 6 [2000]: 341-50) and Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 398-99).

⁹¹ Grünwaldt, *Das Heiligkeitgesetz*, 21.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 385.

⁹³ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 401, 546-47.

⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 550-51.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 564-70.

gram for reading the entire Torah.⁹⁶ Jeffrey Stackert's study of H likewise focuses on its reception of laws from P, the CC, and D, understanding H as a work intended to subvert and replace the earlier laws.⁹⁷ Also Baruch Schwartz understands H as a supplement to P.⁹⁸

Following the line of investigation initiated by Elliger of a post-P Holiness Code, Israel Knohl and Jacob Milgrom argue for H as a school of scribes whose activity to reform P extends beyond Lev 17-26, and have further refined the criteria to distinguish differences between an earlier P and an H revisionist priestly school.⁹⁹ Knohl and Milgrom have offered the most exhaustive treatments of the differences between P and H in matters of the cult, theology, and ethics, though differing slightly in their assessments.¹⁰⁰ Both see H as a school of scribes that extended its activity over centuries, and which was responsible for the final redaction of the Pentateuch through a combination of non-P traditions, P, and D.¹⁰¹ Knohl and Milgrom assign texts outside

⁹⁶ Ibid., 556.

⁹⁷ Jeffrey Stackert, *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation* (FAT 52; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007), 221-25. Stackert's study compares the laws of P, CC, D, and H on cities of refuge (Exod 21:12-14; Deut 19:1-13; Num 35:9-34; Josh 20:1-9), the seventh-year release and slavery laws (Exod 21:2-11; 23:10-11; Deut 15:1-18; Lev 25:1-55), and tithe laws (Exod 21:12; Deut 14:22-29; Num 18:30-32), concluding that H is not a work of inner-biblical mediating exegesis and thus of the Pentateuchal redactor, as it originally was only added to the P materials. Rather, H intends to replace earlier laws as a "super law." Cf. also his "The Holiness Legislation and its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplement, and Replacement," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. S. Schectman and J. Baden; ATANT 95; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 187-204.

⁹⁸ Schwartz, "Introduction: The Strata of the Priestly Writings and the Revised Relative Dating of P and H," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. S. Schectman and J. Baden; ATANT 95; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009), 7; *Leviticus* in *The Jewish Study Bible* (eds. Adele Berlin and Mark Brettler; New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 247.

⁹⁹ Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*.

¹⁰⁰ For a discussion of their disagreements, see Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 225-230; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1426-33.

¹⁰¹ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1439-43. For Milgrom, H consists of four stages of activity: 1. Pre-H1 is pre-Hezekian; 2. H2 is a series of glosses on H1; 3. H (main strata from 8th century), and 4. H_R (Lev 23:2-3, 42-43; 26:1-2, 33b-35, 43-44) is exilic; its main contribution is to emphasize the Sabbath and feast of booths to be kept in exile (Lev 17-22, 1345). See also Milgrom, "H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 29-40, where Milgrom suggests the H_R redaction may also be found in Gen 1:1-2:4; Exod 6:2-8; 16:22-30; 20:8-11; 29:38-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3. Knohl's views are found in *Sanctuary of Silence*, 100-103, 200-203; and "Who Edited the Pentateuch?" in *The Pentateuch*:

of Lev 17-26 to H more than previous scholars had, and reflect on the methodology of detecting H materials outside of Lev 17-26 based on language and theology.¹⁰² Knohl and Milgrom have been followed by Thomas King, who argues that the Priestly narratives in Exodus belong with the Holiness Code, whereas the Genesis Priestly narratives reflect an earlier "Pn" source. For King, Exod 6:2-8 is a key H text that integrates earlier Priestly traditions with H, and additionally Gen 17:1, 8, 14; 36:8-14, 43; Exod 1:1-7, 13-14; 2:23-25; 6:2-8, 28-30; 7:1-6, 17a, 19-20a, 21b-22; 8:1-3, 12-14, 18 (MT); 10:2; 11:9-10; 12:1-20, 49; 14:1-4, 15-18; 15:26; 16:4-34; 20:11; 25:1-9; 27:21; 29:42, 45-46; 31:1-17; 35:1-19 evince signs of H.¹⁰³ Though the distinctions between P and H legislature by Knohl and Milgrom have largely been accepted, their arguments for the extensive presence of H materials outside of Lev 17-26 are often rejected, due to the consequences these assignments would have on the understanding of P^G.¹⁰⁴

2.2.2.2 The Holiness Code as an Integral Part of the Priestly Literature

Following the work of Dillmann, Hoffmann, Eerdmans, and Küchler, several scholars have rejected the distinction between P^G and H by arguing that H is an integral part of the priestly literature. Volker Wagner has suggested that the lack of a clear

International Perspectives on Current Research (eds. T. Dozeman, K. Schmid, and B. Schwartz; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 359-67.

¹⁰² For complete lists of H texts outside of Lev 17-26, see Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 59-106; and the more limited extent of Milgrom, *Lev 17-22*, 1332-44.

¹⁰³ Thomas King, *The Realignment of the Priestly Literature: The Priestly Narrative in Genesis and its Relation to Priestly Legislation and the Holiness School* (Eugene, Or.: Pickwick, 2009), 125-151.

¹⁰⁴ Particularly contested H texts are Exod 6:2-8 and 29:38-46, which are usually considered cornerstones of P^G, and additionally for Milgrom, Gen 1:1-2:4a, and for Knohl, Gen 17:7-8 (Milgrom, "HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33-39; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 102). Taking Exod 6:2-8 and 29:38-46 as H has been widely rejected, as doing so would leave the P^G narrative "a torso without a head" (Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 34), and would be its "*coup de grâce*" (Blum, "Issues and Problems," 34). Likewise taking Gen 2:2-3 and 17:7-8 as part of H leads to a drastic re-evaluation of P^G, which Knohl and Milgrom do not carry forth in their analysis. For objections to Gen 1-2:4a as H, see Jeffrey Stackert, "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath: Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3," *JHS* 11 (2011), 8n26, and for Gen 17:7-8 as H, David Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 134n37.

break in Lev 17 and lack of internal order within Lev 17-26 argues against its independence as a law code.¹⁰⁵ Wagner contends that Exod 25-Lev 26 contains four units with distinct themes, with the natural divisions of Lev 11-22 forming a section on cultic impurities, and Lev 23-25 a section on sacred times.¹⁰⁶ Erhard Blum developed the perspective of Wagner in his *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. According to Blum, the Priestly material is a "P composition" (KP) consisting of sources and redactional material.¹⁰⁷ Blum is critical of the tendency to distinguish between P^G and P^S based on P^G being understood as purely a narrative source. As noted by Blum, if KP is a response to the diverse underlying KD (non-Priestly) tradition that is "Torah" containing both narrative and law, then it can be presumed that KP likewise contains a corresponding combination of narrative and law.¹⁰⁸ Though KP contains diachronic distinctions, it comes from the same internally consistent school forming Priestly traditions.¹⁰⁹ According to Blum, KP forms a narrative developing according to a coherent inner logic from Gen 1-Lev 26 with the presence of God as the main theme. Lev 11-26 contains the climax of this theme, with instructions for preparing a sacred space for YHWH to restore his nearness to humanity, culminating in the promises of Lev 26, which envision the return to the good order of creation in Gen 1:1–2:4a.¹¹⁰ Blum thus considers the Holiness Code as an integral continuation of the KP narrative, and rejects distinctions between H and P.¹¹¹ Especially the covenant texts of KP, from Gen 1-2:4a; 9; 17; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:12-14, form a logical development which cli-

¹⁰⁵ Volker Wagner, "Zur Existenz des sogenannten 'Heiligkeitgesetzes,'" *ZAW* 86 (1974): 307-316.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 312-314. Exod 25-31 form a unit on the theme of building instructions, and Lev 1-7 on sacrifices.

¹⁰⁷ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 220-222.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*, 197, 223.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 224.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 318-332.

¹¹¹ Blum, "Issues and Problems," 31-44.

maxes in Lev 26:9-13, 42-45.¹¹² Therefore Blum calls for a renewed critical examination of the alleged distinctions between H and P.

Blum's view of the coherence of the Priestly literature has been accepted by several scholars. Rolf Rendtorff contends for the importance of the links of Lev 26:9-13, 42-45 with central Priestly texts in Gen 1, 17, 35; Exod 1:7; 25:8; 29:45, which contain "intertextual signs showing that there are theological and literary concepts embracing the Pentateuch as a whole."¹¹³ Though Rendtorff allows for diachronic distinctions within the text, the criteria to make diachronic distinctions are questionable, and Rendtorff prefers a holistic approach to reading Leviticus 17-26 as an integral part of the Priestly tradition.¹¹⁴ Rainer Albertz accepts Blum's KP theory of the Priestly literature, and likewise cautions against attempts to distinguish between different strata, affirming that,

Within this draft [KP] we can recognize traces of a lengthy growth and slightly different accents which in turn indicate a process of discussion within the group of tradents. But they are not marked enough to put the unity of the group in question.¹¹⁵

Following Blum, Albertz sees Lev 26 as the thematic climax of several essential themes of Priestly theology.¹¹⁶ Frank Crüsemann has also rejected the distinctions be-

¹¹² Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 325-29. Blum argues for an integral connection between the covenant formula in Exod 6:2-8 and Lev 26:12, noting that Exod 6:2-8 is clearly associated with H, but at the same time, removing Exod 6:2-8 from P^G would destroy the coherence of P^G (Blum, "Issues and Problems," 34). A solution to this that will be posed below is that both texts belong to H.

¹¹³ Rolf Rendtorff, "Is it possible to read Leviticus as a separate book?" in *Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas* (JSOTSup 227; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 33-34.

¹¹⁴ Rolf Rendtorff, *The Old Testament: An Introduction* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986), 145.

¹¹⁵ Rainer Albertz, *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period, Volume II: From the Exile to the Maccabees* (Trans. John Bowden; OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994), 482. Following Wagner and Blum, Albertz rejects the notion of an independent Holiness Code (629n100).

¹¹⁶ In his recent commentary on Exodus, Albertz notes that Lev 26 is the thematic climax of an integrally linked Priestly composition (*Exodus 1-18* [ZB AT 2.1; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2012], 13). Nevertheless, Albertz delineates distinctions between Priestly redactional layers in his commentary (*Exodus 1-18*, 21-26).

tween P and H.¹¹⁷ According to Crüsemann, "Attempts to demonstrate a special position for Lev 17-26 within the great mass of priestly laws by means of contradictions with other portions must be regarded as failures...Lev 17-26 fits best in the compositional structure of the priestly legislation from Sinai, which unfolds itself with an inner logical consistency."¹¹⁸

The most extensive advancement of Blum's thesis is by Andreas Ruwe, who sees Lev 17-26 as an integral part of the Priestly Sinai composition.¹¹⁹ Ruwe shows that the laws of Lev 17:1-26:2 are characterized by the aspects of "Trennung/Scheidung und Zuordnung" established at creation in Gen 1:1–2:4a. Lev 17-22 contains laws dealing with spatial categories of separations, distinctions and ordering of holiness around the sanctuary, and Lev 23-25 relates to the sacred ordering of time, with Lev 26:2 a subscript reflecting this two-fold focus of the laws expressed as observing the sacred time of the Sabbath and revering the sacred space of the sanctuary.¹²⁰ Obedience to the laws of Lev 17-26 allows the partial restitution of the created order in Gen 1:1–2:4a. Thus Ruwe has established the coherence of the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:4a with the laws of Lev 17-26.

Other scholars have also investigated the significance of Gen 1:1–2:4a for the Holiness Code. Yairah Amit has argued that Gen 1:1–2:4a is an H-text that establishes the importance of the Sabbath in creation for the H-laws.¹²¹ From a different perspec-

¹¹⁷ Frank Crüsemann, *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law* (Trans. Allan W. Mahnke; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996), 277-79, following the work of Blum and Wagner (278n10).

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 278. Crüsemann also strongly opposes literary criticism that removes legislation from the priestly narrative based on the presupposition of P as solely a narrative (282).

¹¹⁹ Andreas Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift,' 32-35.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 365-66. As noted by Ruwe, also Exod 25-40 are determined by the same themes of reverence of the sanctuary and keeping the Sabbath (123-127).

¹²¹ Yairah Amit, "הבריאה ולוח הקדושה" in *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg* (eds. Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey Tigay; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997), 13-29.

tive, Edwin Firmage proposes that the purpose of Gen 1:1–2:4a is "to establish the philosophical underpinnings...of all of the holiness regulations contained in the so-called H document."¹²² Jacob Milgrom, Alan Cooper, Bernard Goldstein, and Philippe Guillaume have likewise suggested that the establishment of the Sabbath in Gen 1:1–2:4a belongs to H, as the foundation of the future legislation on the Sabbath in Lev 17-26.¹²³ Most extensively, Bill T. Arnold has further developed the observations of Amit, Milgrom, Firmage, and Cooper and Goldstein in his article "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," as will be discussed further below.¹²⁴

The considerations of the integral connections of Gen 1:1–2:4a to Lev 17-26 advocated by Blum, Ruwe, Amit, Firmage, Cooper and Goldstein, Guillaume, and Arnold are of fundamental importance to the assessment of the character of the Priestly narrative in Gen-Exod-Lev, pointing to the possibility that Gen 1:1–2:4a and the following Priestly narrative belongs to the H strata, which makes the notion of a P^G narrative that is distinct of H obsolete.

From a different perspective, other scholars have denied the distinction between P and H and the existence of an independent Holiness Code due to the lack of internal coherence and distinctiveness of Lev 17-26. Henry Sun argues that Lev 17-26 does not comprise an independent law code, as its various parts have no underlying unifying principle.¹²⁵ The present form of the text developed in a long process of supplementing, beginning with a "proto-Holiness Code" Lev 18-20, to which materials were added successively, before finally Lev 17 was added to the beginning to incor-

¹²² Edwin Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," *JSOT* 82 (1999): 110.

¹²³ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1344; "H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33-39; Alan Cooper and Bernard Goldstein, "The Development of the Priestly Calendars (I)" 5, 14; Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, ix.

¹²⁴ Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 331–45.

¹²⁵ Henry T. Sun, "An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-Called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-27)," PhD Diss., (Claremont Graduate University, 1990).

porate it into P.¹²⁶ John Hartley, Erhard Gerstenberger, Joseph Blenkinsopp, Gordon Wenham, Wilfried Warning, and Philip Jenson likewise argue based on the lack of clear independence of Lev 17-26 and from its integration within Leviticus as a whole that it does not constitute an independent law code.¹²⁷

There is thus a significant contingency of scholars who deny the independence of Lev 17-26 from the Priestly materials in Gen-Lev, either seeing Lev 17-26 as an integral part of the Priestly literature, or seeing the Priestly narrative in Gen 1:1–2:4a and following as H material.

2.3 Conclusions and Proposal on the History of Research

As seen from this history of research, the question of the extent and parameters of P^G is tied up with how scholars view its purpose. Determining the scope of P^G is thus a conceptual and theological issue, and not simply a matter of assigning individual verses to P^G, P^S, or H based on vocabulary and style.¹²⁸ The question of how much legal material is allowed in the Priestly narrative is likewise determined by the understanding of its purpose, and thus also for the question of the relationship of the Priestly narrative in Gen-Lev to the Holiness Code in Lev 17-26. In the following proposal, I will be exploring a slightly different understanding of P^G for the Priestly narratives in Exodus. To anticipate my conclusions I present the following points:

¹²⁶ Sun, "Investigation," 560-564.

¹²⁷ John Hartley, *Leviticus* (WBC 4; Dallas: Word Books, 1992), 259; Erhard Gerstenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary* (OTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 18; Blenkinsopp, *The Pentateuch*, 224; Gordon Wenham, *The Book of Leviticus* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979), 6-8; Philip Jenson, *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World* (LHBOT 106; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992), 24-25; Wilfried Warning, *Literary Artistry in Leviticus* (BIS 35; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 177-80.

¹²⁸ Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 136.

1. In agreement with Blum, Crüsemann, and Ruwe, I contend that Lev 17-26 is an integral part of the Priestly narrative from Gen 1 to Lev 26. These form a coherent composition of Priestly traditions comprising diverse materials of narrative and law and utilizing earlier non-Priestly sources. Blum's understanding of the Priestly material as "KP" (Priestly composition) that utilizes diverse composition techniques and results in a composition that is neither exclusively a source nor a redaction is thus a fitting description.

2. As has often been noted by scholars since Kuenen and Klostermann, various texts evincing affinities with H form key structuring functions of the Priestly narrative in Exodus, especially Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17.¹²⁹ Most recently these texts have been assigned to H by Knohl and Milgrom. Adding this to the increasing tendency of assigning Gen 1:1–2:4a to H, I will argue that this assignment for these texts in Exodus is correct, though it is usually rejected specifically regarding Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46, due to the fact that assigning these texts to H would remove key pillars of a P^G narrative.

3. To mediate points #1 and #2, I contend that the Priestly material in Gen 1-Lev 26 form an integral literary connection that is fittingly described as an "H composition," as Holiness Torah that instructs using narrative and law.¹³⁰ The history of research on the Priestly narratives has shown that though the narrative is identified as

¹²⁹ Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 278n5; Klostermann, "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," 377.

¹³⁰ Scholars such as James Watts (*Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch* [Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999]), Calum Carmichael (*Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of its Laws and Institutions in Light of Biblical Narratives* [Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006]), and Gershon Hepner (*Legal Friction: Law, Narrative, and Identity Politics in Biblical Israel* [New York: Peter Lang, 2010]) have recently called for a synthetic understanding of the relationship between Pentateuchal narratives and laws, rather than bifurcating them as is common in modern critical approaches. According to Watts, the narratives are an integral part of the rhetoric of Torah intended to persuade its audience to observe the commands (*Reading Law*, 29-33, 88). According to Carmichael, "the key to comprehending biblical legal material is the recognition that what inspires the formulation of biblical rules are incidents in biblical narratives" (*Illuminating Leviticus*, vii).

"Priestly," it has often been noted that it also contains many non-cultic concerns, such as with the covenants and land promises. These juxtaposed concerns have led to the bifurcation between narrative and law, or to a decision between the cult at Sinai or the land of Canaan as the fitting ending of P^G.¹³¹ Beginning with Gen 1:1–2:4a, the Priestly narrative is composed "zur Erläuterung des Entstehens jenes gesetzlichen Zustandes."¹³² The crucial question on the relationship between narrative and law in the Priestly literature is, which laws are the Priestly narratives intended to support?

In the following, a case will be made for understanding the Priestly narrative as an H-composition, specifically establishing the foundations of the laws of the Holiness Code, as noted in the studies on the function of Gen 1:1–2:4a for the legal foundations of Lev 17-26. If Gen 1:1–2:4a is assigned to H, it follows that the subsequent Priestly narratives previously considered P^G should also be H material. Therefore, Knohl and Milgrom are correct in assigning Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17 to H. As Ruwe and others have shown for Gen 1:1–2:4a and its importance for establishing the foundations of the laws of Lev 17-26, I will argue that the Priestly narratives in Exodus likewise establish the foundations for the laws and theology of Lev 17-26. Thus in Exodus the "P^G" narrative is better understood as a H-narrative, forming the backbone of the H-composition that has integrated diverse Priestly and non-Priestly traditions.¹³³

¹³¹ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 2-5.

¹³² Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 108.

¹³³ The view I am proposing is closest to Blum's understanding of P as the "P Komposition:" "Leviticus 17-26* form an essential part of the overall conception of P. The main priestly strand in Genesis to Leviticus [apart from *Einschreibungen* in Exod 30-31*; 35-40*; Lev 27] is, therefore, consistent and coherent in its compositional design. The given differences are due to and in accordance with the internal logic of God's implementation of his *berit* with Abraham/Israel in P. Certainly, the composers had to build their work by integrating quite diverse material" ("Issues and Problems," 39). As demonstrated by Stephen Kaufman, ancient scribes used a wide range of compositional patterns, forming original compositions, confections, and quotations of other texts to form their compositions ("The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism," *HUCA* 53 [1982]: 34). Angela Roskop-Erisman has illustrated this in her work on Gen 9, where she argues that the H-scribes produced a composition "of various elements of cultural repertoire" that were used to develop the character and theme of Gen 9. There is a "complex fusion of repertoire - myth, law, prophetic imagery - from different background contexts. But it is all blended together, tightly linked to the development of the narrative"

The theological and conceptual perspective seen in the texts that give Lev 17-26 its particular character as the "Holiness Code,"¹³⁴ is also seen in the key texts of the Priestly narratives in Gen 1-Lev 26. The Holiness Code legislation is imbued and linked with the themes of creation and Exodus from the Priestly narratives in Genesis and Exodus, which are connected by the unfolding concept of covenant, coming to a climax in the concluding covenant exhortation in Lev 26.

4. Though scholars since Kuenen and Klostermann, and most recently Knohl, Milgrom, and King have suggested that key Priestly texts in Exodus such as Exod 6:2-8; 29:42-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3 belong to H based on their language, it has not been systematically investigated how these texts function in their contexts as part of the Priestly narrative from Gen 1-Lev 26 from the perspective of how they lay the foundations for the H laws in Lev 17-26. The H composition from Gen 1-Lev 26 is focused on the themes of creation and the presence of God, with the covenants and accompanying revelation of the will of God forming the backbone of the plotline. Within the H-composition, the Priestly texts in Exodus describe the liberation from Egypt and the revelation of the divine name YHWH (Exod 6:2-8), followed by the establishment of the sanctuary and the presence of God among Israel (Exod 29:45-46) and granting of the Sabbath as the sign of the Sinai covenant (Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3), as foundational for the H laws in Lev 17-26. My analysis will identify the base-layer

("Mythologizing Life," 108). The recent proposal by Jason Gaines that an earlier "Poetic P" can be distinguished from a later "Prosaic P" based on the criteria of poetry vs. prose severs crucial texts from the developing Priestly narrative and is overly restrictive on limiting ancient scribes to poetry or prose in their compositions (*The Poetic Priestly Source* [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015], 2). The H composition utilizes a wide range of compositional methods as it integrated various Priestly and non-Priestly traditions and developed complex compositional goals, but it may also have later supplements in the spirit of the H legislation itself, as suggested by Milgrom's notion of multiple strata within H (*Leviticus 17-22*, 1345).

¹³⁴ E.g. the characteristic H material functioning as redactional framework of parenthetic statements in Lev 18:1-5, 24-30; 19:1-4; 20:7ff, 22-27; 22:9, 31-33; 25:18ff, 38, 42, 55; 26* (Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237-241; "Innerbiblische Exegese," 172-76).

of the Priestly text traditionally known as P^G, which will be seen in its sections in Exodus to contain linguistic and conceptual links to the Holiness Code, with a function to establish the foundations of the laws of the Holiness Code.

This understanding of the Priestly materials in Gen-Lev 26 as an H composition has consequences that will impact the literary criticism of the Priestly texts, since the understanding of the purpose of the Priestly narrative impacts the question of how much legal material is considered to be originally embedded in the narrative. If the purpose of the Priestly narrative as an H-composition is to establish the foundations for the laws of Lev 17-26, then we would expect legal material to be included in the H-narrative from Gen 1-Lev 26, as is the case with Gen 1:1–2:4a.¹³⁵ We must therefore be cautious about arguing that the H-composition has a main purpose or goal, such as the establishment of the cult, or entrance into the promised land, with a determination that leads to the exclusion of other themes or legal materials *a priori* from the narrative. If the purpose of the H-composition as narrative Torah is to establish the foundations for the legislation in Lev 17-26, then we would expect H legal materials to be interwoven into the H-narratives of Genesis-Exodus.

Secondly, the character of the Priestly narrative as an H-composition raises the question of the presence of "Deuteronomic" or "Deuteronomistic" language in the Priestly narrative. Often the presence of "Deuteronomic" language is used as a criteria for considering a text post-Priestly, such as with Gen 17:9-14 and Exod 6:6-8.¹³⁶ Since however the H legal materials in Lev 17-26 evince close connections with Deuteronomic

¹³⁵ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 282.

¹³⁶ So Grünwaldt considers שמר ברית in Gen 17:9-10 as secondary since it is "deuteronomistisch" (*Exil und Identität: Beschneidung, Passa, und Sabbat in der Priesterschrift* [BBB 85; Frankfurt: Hain Verlag, 1992], 27-30) and Otto likewise for Exod 6:6-8 ("Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 9n43; 10n45).

my and "Deuteronomic" expressions and vocabulary,¹³⁷ we can expect this same scribal profile of "Deuteronomic" language within the H-narratives in Gen 1-Lev 26.¹³⁸

Whether or not the Priestly narrative in Gen-Exod is an independent source or a redaction, it is often noted that it was aware of the non-Priestly tradition or even used it as a *Vorlage*.¹³⁹ Thus the Priestly narrative is involved in the process of interpreting and extending the pre-Priestly narrative, which is considered to be in some sense "deuteronomistisch" or "jehowistisch-deuteronomistisch."¹⁴⁰ We should therefore resist literary-critical assignments of Priestly texts based on the presence of "Deuteronomistic" language, especially given the close similarities between H and D language and the long process of mutual influencing that took place between the Priestly and Deuteronomic scribes.¹⁴¹ Likewise, the presence of D language in Lev 17-26 should not be used as a criteria for distinguishing the Priestly narratives in Gen-Exod as distinct from the Holiness Code.¹⁴²

Finally, what can be said of the internal differences within the Priestly materials, if Gen 1-Lev 26 are considered a unified H composition? Against Knohl and Mil-

¹³⁷ So for Alfred Cholewinski, the main HG redaction of Lev 17-26 can be considered from within the D movement (*Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*, 343); Otto, "Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitgesetz Levitikus 17-26," 173-80.

¹³⁸ Meg Warner, *And I Will Remember my Covenant with Abraham: The Holiness School in Genesis* (Th.D. Diss.; Melbourne College of Divinity, 2011), 23.

¹³⁹ For a recent state of the question, see Thomas Römer, "Zwischen Urkunden, Fragmenten, und Ergänzungen: Zum Stand der Pentateuchforschung," *ZAW* 125 (2013): 16-17; de Pury, "P^G as Absolute Beginning," 105n20. Scholars who argue for the Priestly narrative as a redaction of non-P are Cross (*Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 293-325), Blum (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 229-85), Rendtorff (*The Problem of the Process of Transmission of the Pentateuch*, 156-177), Albertz (*Exodus 1-18, 10-26*), Christophe Berner (*Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels* [FAT 73; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010]), and Jakob Wöhrle (*Fremdlinge im eigenen Land: Zur Entstehung und Intention der priesterlichen Passagen der Vätergeschichte* [FRLANT 246; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2012]). On Exod 25-40, see Helmut Utzschneider, *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz: Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Exod 25-40; Lev 8-9)* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1988), 107-108.

¹⁴⁰ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 10-12.

¹⁴¹ Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*, 299.

¹⁴² The approach of Otto is therefore problematic, as he removes Exod 6:6-8 from P^G due to its D language, and then distinguishes between P^G and H based on the absence of D language in his P^G and the presence of such in H (*Theologische Ethik*, 237; "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 9n43, 10n45).

grom, who contend that P and H represent competing priestly schools with distinct theologies,¹⁴³ and also against Cholewinski and Otto, who describe the relationship of H to P as polemical,¹⁴⁴ the differences within the Priestly materials are relatively minor cultic matters.¹⁴⁵ The differences in terminology are to be understood as the utilization of earlier Priestly sources or fragments that have variant expressions, particularly with regards to cultic rituals.¹⁴⁶ As will be shown below, the Priestly narratives in Gen-Exod are consistent with the characteristic H material that structures Lev 17-26 and brings the themes of the H composition to its climax in Lev 26.

¹⁴³ Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 6-7; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1349-57.

¹⁴⁴ Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*, 334-338; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237.

¹⁴⁵ Blum, "Issues and Problems," 34-38; *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 335-36n10; Ruwe, *'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 30-32.

¹⁴⁶ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 278; Blum, *Komposition*, 322.

Chapter 3

Objections against the continuity of the Priestly Narrative and H

3. State of the Question

Before a positive case for the Priestly narratives in Exodus as being consistent with H can be made, I will respond to objections raised against the unity of P^G and H based on proposed linguistic, conceptual, and theological differences. These objections have been refuted already by Blum and Ruwe,¹ but will be presented here as a foundation for the following arguments for a positive case for the unity of the P^G narrative and Lev 17-26 as the H-composition. Contrary to these objections, it can be shown that there are no linguistic, conceptual, or theological reasons to consider the main Priestly narrative from Gen 1 onward as inconsistent with the characteristic H-material of Lev 17-26. The slight differences can be explained as integral to the developing storyline of the relationship between God and Israel which "unfolds itself with an inner logical consistency"² that the H composition expresses.

The modern arguments for the inconsistency between P^G and H go back to Cholewinski's view that H polemicizes against P^G, as reiterated recently by Otto, Zenger, and Ska.³ Likewise, Knohl and Milgrom have developed detailed classifications of the differences between P and H, though mostly based on differences in cultic and ritual matters. These ritual differences can be explained however by the use of diverse cultic materials in the overarching Holiness Composition.⁴ What is of primary

¹ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 336-37n10; Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitgesetz,' und 'Priesterschrift,' 30-31; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 278.

² Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 278; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 300-28.

³ Wellhausen already argued against the consistency of P and H due to the parenetic tone of H, and its reception of Deuteronomy and similarities with Ezekiel as distinguishing it from P (*Die Composition*, 149-150).

⁴ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 336-37n10; Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitgesetz,' und 'Priesterschrift,' 30-31.

interest here is the relationship between what is considered the P^G narrative and H, which I am arguing present a unified conceptual and theological whole as an H composition. The following points have been proposed as irreconcilable differences between P^G and H:

3.1. Different views of land ownership

First, Cholewinski contends that Lev 25:23-24 (H) advances the view that the land of Canaan belongs exclusively to YHWH, and that the Israelites are strangers and sojourners on the land (כי לי הארץ כי גרים ותושבים אתם עמדי), which is a "correction of the view advocated by P," that the land is given as an unconditional possession to the Israelites (Exod 6:4 הקמתי את בריתי אתם לתת להם את ארץ כנען את ארץ מגריהם; Exod 6:8 והבאתי אתכם אל הארץ אשר נשאתי את ידי לתת אתה לאברהם; אשר גרו בה).⁵ Against this supposed difference, first of all it can be mentioned that Lev 25:38 shares the same notion as Exod 6:4, 7-8 of YHWH giving Israel the land: אני יהוה אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי אתכם מארץ מצרים לתת לכם את ארץ כנען.⁶ Thus within H, the view of YHWH owning the land and YHWH giving it to the Israelites are not contradictory, as it is also affirmed that the Israelites "inherit" (ירש) the land of Canaan (Lev 20:24). The same double-perspective is seen in the P^G narratives as well. As has been noted by Matthias Köckert, Michaela Bauks, and others, the P conception of the land as an *אחזה* denotes the right to use the land (Gen 17:8; 48:4), whereas the land remains in the possession of YHWH.⁷ Though the

⁵ Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 334; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 152; Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 173.

⁶ Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitgesetz,' und 'Priesterschrift,' 30.

⁷ Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 78n21; Bauks, "Die Begriffe מורשה und אחזה in P^G: Überlegungen zur Landkonzeption in der Priestergrundschrift," *ZAW* 116 (2004), 174-76; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 66-68; Wöhrle, *Fremdlinge im eigenen Land*, 197-98; Römer, "Zwischen Urkunden, Fragmenten und Ergänzungen," 18.

patriarchs acquire possession (יָרַשׁ, מורשה; Gen 28:4; Exod 6:8) of the land as an inheritance,⁸ the land can still be called an אחזת עולם as well as ארץ מגרים (Gen 17:8; 28:4; Exod 6:4) on which the patriarchs live as sojourners.⁹ Therefore just as in H, in the P^G narratives the land ultimately belongs to YHWH, and the patriarchs are גרים on the land. Therefore the H conception of the land is consistent with the P^G narratives, and it can be said that Lev 25:23-24 affirms the P^G view of the land.¹⁰ In P^G the patriarchs can leave the land, but the land remains the possession of YHWH and the promise of the return of the Israelites to the land remains open for the future. The same perspective is fundamental to the H view of the land in Lev 25-26, as developed by Klaus Grünwaldt. Though disobedience can lead to Israel's temporary removal from the land, this does not sever Israel's ties to the land.¹¹ Just as the Israelites were removed from the land during the Egyptian slavery, and were restored to the land by YHWH remembering his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (זכר Exod 2:23; 6:5), so also in H, YHWH will remember the covenant with the patriarchs and bring an exiled Israel back to the land (זכר Lev 26:42-45).

3.2. The Identity of Israel as the People of YHWH or Slaves of YHWH

A second proposed conflict between P^G and H is the suggestion that H corrects the P^G notion of the exodus occurred in order to make the Israelites the people of YHWH (לֵךְ אֶתְכֶם לִי לְעָם Exod 6:7), in favor of the perspective of the Israelites be-

⁸ On this meaning of יָרַשׁ see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 67n244.

⁹ Ibid., 68; Wöhrle, *Fremdlinge im eigenen Land*, 197-98; Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 78.

¹⁰ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 68; Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Priesterschriftlichen Sühnetheologie* (WMANT 55; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 2000), 321. For Römer, Lev 25:23-24 is consistent with P^G and clarifies the P^G conception of the land as ארץ מגרים in Gen 17:7-8; Exod 6:4-8 ("Zwischen Urkunden, Fragmenten und Ergänzungen," 17-18).

¹¹ Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 345, 395.

ing defined as slaves or servants of YHWH in the Exodus (לִי בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל עֲבָדִים עַבְדֵי הֵם) Lev 25:55).¹² It is true that Lev 25:55 expresses the relationship between Israel and YHWH in terms of servitude, which characterization is not found previously in the P^G narrative. However, this difference does not reflect a conflict between P^G and H. This nuanced expression of the relationship between Israel and YHWH can be understood from the developing logic of the Holiness Composition and the intentions of the context of Lev 25 to express the rationale against Israelites compelling their kinsmen to slavery. Consistent with P^G, H understands the purpose of the exodus as YHWH becoming the God of Israel and separating Israel from the nations to be His people (אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֲשֶׁר הִבְדַּלְתִּי אֶתְכֶם מִן הָעַמִּים Lev 20:24). In Lev 26:9-13, H expresses the same perspective of the relationship between YHWH and Israel as seen in Exod 6:2-8:

Lev 26:9, 12-13	Exod 6:4, 7
A והקימתי את בריתי אתכם (v. 9b)	A' הקמתי את בריתי אתם (v. 4a)
B והייתי לכם לאלהים (v. 12a)	C' ולקחתי אתכם לי לעם (v. 7a)
C ואתם תהיו לי לעם (v. 12b)	B' והייתי לכם לאלהים (v. 7aβ)
D אני יהוה אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי אתכם מארץ מצרים להיות להם עבדים (v. 13a)	D' אני יהוה אלהיכם המוציא אתכם מתחת סבלות מצרים (v. 7b).

Exodus 6:4, 7 shares the same concepts as Lev 26:9-13: the covenant with Israel will be maintained (קום), YHWH will be God for Israel, Israel will be the people (עם) of YHWH, and YHWH brings Israel out of Egyptian slavery.¹³ According to Blum, these texts form a "kompositorische Klammer in dem Komplex 'Exodus und Sinai'" that functions as an announcement and retrospect.¹⁴ For H, Israel is the people of God just as in the P^G narrative (Exod 6:2-8), but the implications of this status attained at the

¹² Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 334; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 152.

¹³ Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2298. Due to this similarity, Milgrom, Knohl, and many earlier scholars have affirmed that Exod 6:2-8 is an H text. Conversely, others have argued that Lev 26:9, 12-13 is a P text due to its similarity with Exod 6:2-8.

¹⁴ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 328.

Exodus are expressed in two further directions that place an ethical impetus on Israel:¹⁵ Israel is set apart by God from among the nations (בדל Lev 20:24) in the Exodus from Egypt, and therefore they must be holy. Israel is transferred from slavery to the Egyptians into a position of servitude to YHWH (Lev 25:55), which implies ethical obligations.¹⁶ Exodus 6:2-8 and Lev 17-26 thus share the perspective of Israel being the people of YHWH, but in Lev 25, H expresses this relationship for rhetorical purposes in nuanced ways as rationales for ethics. There are no grounds for saying H corrects the P^G notion of Israel as the people of YHWH in Exod 6:2-8, since H affirms the notion of Israel being the people of YHWH (Lev 26:12).¹⁷

3.3. Conceptions of the Covenant

Likewise it is argued that the P^G and H concepts of covenant differ.¹⁸ Two influential studies have led to this understanding of the relationship between the P^G and H covenants. First of all, Walther Zimmerli's study of the relationship between the Sinai covenant and the Abrahamic covenant in the Priestly narrative led him to conclude that P^G knows only a Noahic (Gen 6-9*) and an Abrahamic (Gen 17*) covenant.¹⁹ There is no Sinai covenant in P^G, but rather Israel stands under the conditions of the Abrahamic covenant. Thus P^G disassociates the covenant from obedience to Sinaitic Torah, and understands it as a covenant of grace granted to Abraham inde-

¹⁵ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 302; Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17-26* (VTSup 67; Leiden: Brill, 1996), 97-98.

¹⁶ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 304-306; Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 343-45, 390.

¹⁷ According to Cholewinski, Lev 25:55 deepens (*vertieft*) the P^G covenant formula from Exod 6:7 (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, 334). Otto expresses the difference as H correcting (*korrigiert*) P^G (*Theologische Ethik*, 237).

¹⁸ Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 334-35; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 152; Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 173.

¹⁹ Zimmerli, "Sinaibund und Abrahambund: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift," in *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament* (München: Kaiser Verlag, 1963), 205-216.

pendent of his obedience, in which Israel now stands.²⁰ A second contribution is by Norbert Lohfink, who argues that the ברית in Lev 26:9-13 represents a development beyond the P^G covenant of Gen 17 by mediating it with the Deuteronomic concept of the covenant as dependent on obedience to Torah.²¹ The proposals of Zimmerli and Lohfink have been critiqued from various perspectives, but they remain influential.²²

In order to understand the relationship between the ברית in the Priestly narratives of Gen-Exod and Lev 26, the term itself needs to be examined. First of all, ברית is related to promises of blessing (ברכה) initiated at creation (Gen 1:28), where אלהים blesses humanity for the task of being fruitful (פרה) and multiplying (רבה).²³ These blessings come under threat in the flood (Gen 6-9*). Following the flood, God reiterates the blessing (ברכה) of fruitfulness (Gen 9:1), and gives a further promise to the whole creation (Gen 9:9-10), this time called a ברית, according to which God will not destroy the world in a flood. The promise is accompanied by the rainbow as a sign of the covenant (אות ברית Gen 9:12-17), by which God will remember (זכר Gen 9:16-17) his promise. This eternal self-obligation of God (ברית עולם Gen 9:16) however entails two commandments: abstaining from eating blood, and prohibition of murder (Gen 9:4-6). Violating these commands is punishable by death, which removes the indi-

²⁰ Ibid., 213.

²¹ Lohfink, "Die Abänderung der Theologie des priesterlichen Geschichtswerks im Segen des Heiligkeitgesetzes: Zu Lev 26,9, 11-13," in *Wort und Geschichte: Festschrift für Karl Elliger zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. H. Gese and H. Rüger; AOAT 18; Kevelaer: Butzon&Berker, 1973), 129-136.

²² Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 325-29; Joosten, *People and Land in the Holiness Code*, 117-18; Stackert, "Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction: Leviticus 26 as a Test Case," in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* [eds. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz (FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 375-76, 380-81; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 305-306; Milgrom, *Leviticus* 23-27, 2298.

²³ Cf. recently Benjamin Ziemer, *Abram-Abraham: Kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Gen 14, 15, und 17* (BZAW 35; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 299-300; "Schöpfung, Heiligtum, und Sabbat in der priesterlichen Bundeskonzeption," in *Ex Oriente Lux: Studien zur Theologie des Alten Testaments. Festschrift für Rüdiger Lux zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. Angelika Berjelson and Raik Heckl; ABG 39; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2012), 39-42; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 296-97.

vidual from the blessings of the covenant promise. Thus for the individual offender, the blessings of the promise of the covenant are conditional upon obedience to the conditions. The relationship between God and the world to whom the eternal promise was made however remains intact.²⁴

The same two-fold dynamic continues in the ברית with Abraham in Gen 17. The creation blessings of fruitfulness and multiplying are once again central to the ברית (Gen 17:6, 20). Abraham has reached the age of ninety-nine, and is without an heir with Sarah. El Shaddai promises to make him fruitful (פרה), but the creation promise is also extended to include the gift of the land of Canaan (Gen 17:8), and also God promises to be the God of Abraham and his descendants (והייתי להם לאלהים Gen 17:7-8). The promise is unconditionally an everlasting promise (ברית עולם Gen 17:7), but as in Gen 9:4-6, it is accompanied by a command for Abraham and his descendants to observe the covenant by circumcision (בריתי תשמר Gen 17:9-13), which is the sign of the covenant (אות ברית) to be observed eternally (Gen 17:13). The blessings of the covenant for an individual are conditioned by the command, as violating the commandment of circumcision leads to that individual being removed (כרת Gen 17:14) from the promises for breaking (פרר) the covenant conditions, though the covenant promise itself stands unconditionally. The promise of the covenant narrows the recipients from Gen 9* (the world) to the family of Abraham, that is both Isaac (17:19, 21) and Ishmael (17:20), and adds the notion of אלהים being God for Abraham's family, and the grant of the land of Canaan as a promise (Gen 17:7-8).²⁵ God makes unconditional promises in the covenants of Gen 9 and 17, accompanied by

²⁴ Nihan, "The Priestly Covenant," 102.

²⁵ For a discussion of the relationship between Ishmael and Isaac as recipients of the ברית in Gen 17, see Ziemer, *Abram-Abraham*, 309-311.

human obligations. Violation of the conditions removes the individual from the community who share the blessings of the promises, but does not annul the promises. As the circle of recipients of the promises narrows from the world to Abraham's descendants, the content of the promise adds the land and the special relationship with God, accompanied by an increase in obligations with circumcision.²⁶

The next development in the Priestly covenants is in Exod 1:7; 2:23-25; 6:2-8. In this sequence, the promise of the descendants of Abraham multiplying has led to the sons of Jacob (cf. Gen 35:9-12) becoming a nation in Egypt (בני ישראל פרו...וירבו) Exod 1:7). They cry out in slavery, and God hears them and remembers (זכר) his promises to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (2:23-25). God appears to Moses and reveals himself as יהוה, reiterating his promise to Abraham to give his descendants the land and to be their God (Exod 6:2-8). The salvation of Israel from Egypt is therefore triggered by YHWH remembering (זכר) his covenant promises (Exod 2:24; 6:5). Following the Exodus, the Priestly covenant theme continues when Israel reaches Sinai in the climactic speech of Exod 29:43-46. Here YHWH further specifies the promise by affirming He will dwell among the Israelites (Exod 29:45-46), which presence requires Israel to be holy, and thus entails the obligations of sanctification.²⁷ This Sinai promise is accompanied by the Sabbath as the *אוֹת בְּרִית* which is a sign of the sanctification of Israel, and therefore of the presence of God among Israel (Exod 31:13, 17).²⁸ Individual violation of the Sabbath leads to removal from the midst of

²⁶ Nihan, "The Priestly Covenant," 101-102; Stackert, "Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction," 377-381.

²⁷ Otto, "Innerbiblische Exegese," 175; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 307-308; and Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 299.

²⁸ It is usually assumed that Exod 31:12-17 do not belong to the strata of the Gen 9:1-17, 17:1-27 and Exod 6:2-8; 29:43-46 covenant statements due to its affinity with H language and its inclusion of a Sinai covenant, which is considered since Zimmerli and Lohfink to be contrary to the Priestly theology of grace (Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 567-68). As will be developed more extensively below, there are no imminent grounds to distinguish diachronically between these

the people, and thus from the blessings of the presence of YHWH amidst the people (Exod 31:14).

Thus the Priestly covenant texts present a well-structured, consistently developing plan in Gen 9:1-17, Gen 17:1-27, and Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:12-17. In each of these texts, ברית is used in the sense of a divine promise which is given to a narrowing circle of addressees, from the world, to Abraham's descendants, to Israel. The promise extends from fruitfulness and multiplication and the stability of heaven and earth (Gen 1:1-2:4a; 9:1-17), to the promise of the land and El Shaddai being God for Abraham's descendants (Gen 17:1-27), to the promise of YHWH revealing himself to Israel and dwelling among Israel and sanctifying them (Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46, 31:12-17). Each covenant is accompanied by a sign that symbolizes an aspect of the divine promise.²⁹ The rainbow is a symbol of God committing to no longer use a flood to destroy the world (Gen 9),³⁰ circumcision is associated with the promise of fruitfulness extended to Abraham (Gen 17),³¹ and the Sabbath is a sign of YHWH's commitment to be Israel's God, to dwell among Israel and hence of Israel's sanctification (Exod 29:43-46; 31:13-17). The signs function as reminders to God and the human counterparts in the covenant, and consequently as a symbol of membership in the

covenant statements. Cf. Ziemer, *Abram-Abraham*, 302-303; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 296-99; Odil Hannes Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift: Studien zur literarkritischen und überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Problematik von Genesis 1:1-2:4a* (2nd ed.; FRLANT 115; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1981), 191, and Blum, "Issues and Problems," 35, who consider Exod 31:12-17* as an integral continuation of the Priestly covenant statements.

²⁹ Already Nöldeke (*Untersuchungen*, 55) and Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, 358-59) considered the signs of the rainbow, circumcision, and Sabbath as forming an integral connection. Cf. the occurrence of בְּיָמֵינוּ וּבְיָמֵיכֶם + אֶת in Gen 9:12; 17:11; Exod 31:13, and ברית in Gen 9:12; 17:13; 31:16. Each of the signs is connected to the Genesis 1:1-2:4a blessings of creation: the rainbow as a symbol for the preservation of creation, circumcision as a symbol of the blessing of fruitfulness of creation, and the Sabbath as an imitation of the rest of God at creation (Ziemer, *Abram-Abraham*, 314-16; "Schöpfung, Heiligtum, und Sabbat," 41). These common elements between the covenant signs in Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 31:13-17 suggest that they form an "übergreifendes System" (Ziemer, "Schöpfung, Heiligtum, und Sabbat," 40-41).

³⁰ Arnold, "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative," 32-34; Fox, "The Sign of the Covenant: Circumcision in the Light of the Priestly 'ôt Etiologies," *RB* 81 (1974), 573.

³¹ Fox, "The Sign of the Covenant," 590-596; Ziemer, *Abram-Abraham*, 305.

covenant community who are recipients of the promises of God.³² According to Gen 9:15-16, the sign of the rainbow will remind YHWH of his commitment to not destroy Israel, in Exod 2:24; 6:5, YHWH remembers his promise to Abraham, based on which he saves Israel from Egypt, and observing the Sabbath will enable Israel's restoration from exile (Lev 26:34-45). Each covenant promise is also accompanied by the required observance of various conditions, which increase in accordance to the increasing proximity to God: the prohibition of blood consumption and murder apply to all creation (Gen 9:4-6), circumcision is for Abraham's descendants (Gen 17:9-14), and the Sabbath and sanctification is for Israel (Exod 29:45-46; 31:12-17). Failure to comply with the obligations leads to the offending individuals breaking or annulling (פרר) their side of the covenant, and a subsequent removal from the blessings of the covenant promises, but it does not annul the promises.³³

How does this developing Priestly view of the covenant relate to the covenant statements in Lev 26? As several scholars have noted, many of the covenant statements in Lev 26 are indistinguishable from those in the P^G narratives, often leading to their assignment to P^G in the history of research.³⁴ The same ברית theme developing in Gen 1:1–2:4a; 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:12-17 continues in Lev 26, which is closely connected to the Exodus covenant texts in 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:12-17,

³² The slight differences between the signs can be understood from the developing narrative logic. Each of these signs (including Exod 31:13-17), function as cognitive signs for recollection of the relationship between God and the recipients of the signs, and share a similar chiasmic pattern (Fox, "The Sign of the Covenant," 576, 588, 595), and have two aspects: they mark the recipients of the covenant promises (world, Abraham, Israel), and remind the recipients of their obligations to the promises (limit violence, circumcision, sanctification). So according to Daniel Timmer, the Sabbath is the sign to remind Israel of its distinctive relationship and standing before God that was made possible at the Exodus (*Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:12-17; 35:1-3 in Exegetical and Theological Perspective* [FRLANT 227; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2009], 55).

³³ Nihan, "The Priestly Covenant," 102; Stackert, "Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction," 380-384.

³⁴ Kilian, *Untersuchung*, 174; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 296-97.

which has resulted in all of these texts in Exodus being assigned to H by Knohl and Milgrom for example.³⁵ Blum, Crüsemann, and Albertz have further contended that Lev 26 is the essential climax of the ברית statements in the Priestly composition KP that actualizes the history of the covenants of God with the world, Abraham, and Israel for the present generation addressed in the composition.³⁶

The ברית statements in Lev 26 share the same dynamic of promises and obligations as seen in the ברית statements of Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:13-17. Lev 26:9-13 picks up the theme of fruitfulness and multiplication (פרה רבה) from Gen 1:28 that forms the foundation of the Priestly covenant promises (Gen 9:1, 6; 17:6, 20; 35:11; Exod 1:7). Also the promise of YHWH being God for Israel is taken up (Lev 26:12; cf. Gen 17:7-8; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46), and the promise of YHWH dwelling among Israel (Lev 26:11-12) in the promised land. Thus all of the promises of the Priestly covenant statements in Gen-Exod reach their climax in Lev 26.³⁷ In Lev 26, the promises are made conditional upon Israel's obedience to the חקות and מצות of the Sinai Torah (Lev 26:3, 14-15). Disobedience to these commandments constitutes breaking or annulling (פרר Lev 26:15, 44) the covenant, and lead to the loss of the blessings of creation and the loss of the land (26:16-33).

Since the proposal by Lohfink, it has been common to argue that in Lev 26 the P^G concept of covenant has been subjected to a "Deuteronomizing" of the covenant, making it conditional on the keeping of Sinai Torah, and therefore P^G and H represent conflicting notions of the ברית that cannot be from the same strata.³⁸ Using the same

³⁵ Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 104; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1343.

³⁶ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 325-26; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 304-305; Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 13.

³⁷ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 325-26.

³⁸ Lohfink, "Die Abänderung der Theologie des priesterlichen Geschichtswerks," 129-136.

logic however it could also be argued that in relation to the covenant in Gen 9:1-17, Gen 17:1-27 represents subjecting the Noahic covenant to the condition of circumcision, and thus they are conflicting notions of covenant.³⁹ This view however does not take into consideration the developing logic of the Priestly covenants within the narrative. In contrast to Lohfink, Lev 26 can be read as internally consistent with the earlier Priestly covenants in Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:13-17, as reflecting the development of narrowing down of the addressees to the Israelites, which coincides with an increase in obligations going beyond the world and the Abrahamic descendants in Gen 9:1-17 and 17:1-27. In all of the Priestly covenant statements, including Lev 26, the ברית as a promise is unconditional. Israel may disobey their side of the covenant obligations of the Sinai Torah, which constitutes breaking (פרר Lev 26:15, 44; cf. Gen 17:14) the covenant on their part and leading to the loss of the blessings for those responsible, but the promises of the covenant are unconditional.⁴⁰ As affirmed in Lev 26:42-46, the bond between YHWH and Israel cannot be broken: YHWH on his part will never break his promise (פרר ברית Lev 26:44) to be their God.⁴¹ The covenant promises stand eternally for Israel to attain, if they submit to

³⁹ Scholars such as Grünwaldt unpersuasively contend that the circumcision command in Gen 17 is secondary, due to its imposition of conditions onto the purely one-sided Noahic blessing ברית (Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 58-59).

⁴⁰ According to Grünwaldt, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz klingt mit einer unbedingten Heilzusage (v.45) aus" (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, 373). Cf. Stackert, "Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction," 381; Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," in *Leviticus als Buch* [eds. H.-J. Fabry and H.-W. Jüngling; BBB 119; Bodenheim: Philo, 1999], 298-99.

⁴¹ These verses are often considered secondary based on presuppositions about conditionality vs. unconditionality of the covenant, as with Lohfink, for whom these verses represent a rejection of the "Deuteronomized" Lev 26:3-39, with a return to the pure Priestly grace theology (*Abänderung*, 134-36). The current trend however sees the chapter as essentially unified, with no compelling reasons to remove vv.42-45: Cf. Georg Fischer, "A Need for Hope? A Comparison between the Dynamics in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28-30*, in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond* (eds. Roy E. Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015), 373-74; Stackert, "Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction," 374n15; Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," 273; Marjo Korpel, "The Epilogue to the Holiness Code," in *Verses in Ancient Near Eastern Prose* (eds. J.C.de Moor and W.G.E. Watson; AOAT 42; Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon und Bercker; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993), 123-150; Jan Joosten, "Covenant Theology in the Holiness Code," *ZAR* 4 (1998): 151n30; Nihan, "The Priestly

their obligations to the ברית.⁴² Within the context of Lev 26, what has led to the breaking (פרר) of the promises is more generally rejecting the משפטים, חקות, and מצות, indicating the laws of Sinai or the Holiness Code as a whole (Lev 26:15).⁴³ The only violation that is mentioned specifically is failure to keep the Sabbath, described in 26:34-35, 43 as the cause of the exile. This suggests that the Sabbath functions as the sign of the Sinai covenant, which is correlated with Exod 31:12-17.⁴⁴ In Exod 31:12-17, the Sabbath is a sign (אות) that is a ברית עולם (Exod 31:16) between YHWH and Israel that YHWH sanctifies Israel (לדרתיכם לדעת) כי אות הוא ביני וביניכם (Exod 31:13).⁴⁵ Failure to keep the Sabbath results in being removed from the promise of YHWH sanctifying Israel, and thus from the possibility of living in the presence of YHWH (31:14). Thus Exod 31:12-17 can be understood in line with the priestly covenants and signs from Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27, as the Sinaitic counterpart, whose full meaning for the Sinai covenant is developed in the conclusion of the Sinai legislation in Lev 26.⁴⁶ It is possible for Israelites who have broken the covenant to be restored to the blessings of the covenant through repentance (Lev 26:40-41). The possibility of restoration is triggered by YHWH remembering (זכר) his

Covenant," 106-109. For detailed objections against removing vv.42-45, see Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 327n147.

⁴² Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," 298-99.

⁴³ Ibid., 299; cf. Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 552, on Lev 26:46 including the entire Sinaitic law from Exod 20-Lev 26 within the conditions of the covenant.

⁴⁴ Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," 299; Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 296-97.

⁴⁵ As noted by Ruwe, the Sabbath itself in this case is not the sign of the covenant as the signs are in Gen 9:12-17; Gen 17:11-14, which function as reassurance between the covenant partners. Rather, the Sabbath functions as a sign between Israel and YHWH that leads to external recognition that YHWH is the one who sanctifies Israel as a symbol of the relationship between Israel and YHWH (Ruwe, *'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 126).

⁴⁶ Cross, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 296-97; Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," 299.

promises to the patriarchs and Exodus generation (Lev 26:42, 45; cf. Gen 9:15-16; Exod 2:24; 6:5).⁴⁷

In summary, Lev 26 stands in a consistent line with the Priestly covenant theology from Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27 and Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:13-17. There is a developing narrowing of the circle of addressees with increasing promises, from the world, to Abraham, to Israel, which coincides also with an increase in obligations from humans due to increasing proximity to God in order to maintain their part of the covenant.⁴⁸ The special relationship that Israel has with YHWH and the presence of YHWH among Israel demands holiness as expressed in observance to the Sinaitic Torah for Israel to maintain their side of the covenant.⁴⁹ In all of the covenants, the promises of YHWH are unconditional, though individuals may violate (פרר) their conditions of the covenant which leads to the loss of the blessings.⁵⁰ Observing the Sinaitic Torah is the climactic expression of Israel's response to the promises of God, and enables the restoration of the original conditions and promises of creation and the

⁴⁷ Ibid., 297; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 305-306.

⁴⁸ Ziemer, "Schöpfung, Heiligtum, und Sabbat," 40; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 328.

⁴⁹ The national perspective of the final circle addressing the covenant responsibilities Israel is accountable for in Lev 26 is the cause for the difference in perspective from individual responsibility to communal responsibility in Lev 26, as the main conceptual difference between Lev 26 and the previous Priestly covenant texts (Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," 297; Joosten, *People and Land*, 118; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1423).

⁵⁰ The phrase ברית הקים relates to the upholding of the promises from creation, found in Gen 9:11; 17:7, 19; Exod 6:4; and Lev 26:9 (Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 325), or establishing an already existing covenant. As noted by Milgrom, the antonym is פרר (*Leviticus 23-27*, 2343-45).

presence of God.⁵¹ What is stated by David Carr in his study of the P narrative in Genesis fits as an understanding of the H-composition climaxing in Leviticus 26:

P builds a bridge between these two layers [primeval and present time] by using the themes of eternity and memory. God establishes covenants with Noah and Abraham, and then "remembers" them at crucial junctures. On the other side, Israel is "reminded" of its paradigmatic history (as conceived by P) by elements such as circumcision (an "eternal covenant") and Passover ("an eternal decree")...The world has certain created and covenantal structures. God has always remembered. Now Israel, standing at the brink of possible return to the land and reestablishment of its cult, must remember as well.⁵²

It is Leviticus 26, as the exhortative climax of the H-composition, which "builds a bridge" between primeval and present time, reminding Israel of its paradigmatic history and the eternal creational and covenantal structures of promise, and calling Israel to remember and obey Torah. Lev 26 is thus parenetic preaching of the traditions of the covenant to the addressees of the H-composition, which draws out the implications of the H covenant theology from the history of the world, the patriarchal history, and Exodus accounts for the present generation, bringing them hope of salvation and exhortation to Torah observance.⁵³

⁵¹ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 326-333; Alberty, *Israelite Religion*, 2: 492. This is seen especially in the theme of the walking (הלך) of God with humans in the Priestly writings as traced by Blum. In the pre-diluvian world, Enoch and Noah are blameless and walk with God (הלך את אלהים Gen 5:22-24; 6:9). Following the corruption of the world in the flood, Abraham is only able to walk before YHWH (הלך לפני Gen 17:1). This theme comes to a climax in Lev 26. YHWH will walk among Israel (תהלך בתוכי Lev 26:12) and has broken the bonds of Israel and enabled them to walk upright (אולך אתכם קוממיות Lev 26:13). Thus the motif of walking expresses the restoration of relationship with God as made possible by obedience to the Torah.

⁵² Carr, *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 140.

⁵³ Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," 300. So according to James Watts, Lev 26 is the climactic exhortation expressing the rhetorical intentions of the entire Priestly Torah. The blessings of the earlier promises from creation and the history of Israel in Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27, and Exod 6:2-8 as linked in Lev 26 are now attainable for those who observe the Torah. Priestly narratives persuade hearers to observe the Torah by describing its origins in creation, by specifying the ideal divine-human relationship that it makes possible, and by promising blessings and threatening curses (*Reading Law*, 58-60).

3.4. Presence of Deuteronomistic Terminology

It is argued by Cholewinski, Otto, and Ska that the presence of Deuteronomistic terminology in Lev 17-26 distinguishes H from P^G, since P^G does not show influence of D.⁵⁴ As mentioned above, this is a problematic assumption, given the fact that P^G is a narrative, whereas Lev 17-26 is law. It is not to be expected that the P^G narrative would evince traits of Deuteronomistic legal terminology. Further, various sections of the P^G narrative do contain language similar to Deuteronomy, such as Exod 6:6-8 and Gen 17:9-14, which sometimes is used as criteria to excise such verses from P^G.⁵⁵ The P^G narrative however is related to the non-P narrative in the sense of expanding and interpreting it, and can occasionally reflect the language of the non-P narrative which can be "Deuteronomic." If the P^G narrative is a complex of materials that relates to the non-Priestly narrative, then it can be affirmed that "Deuteronomic" language and concepts are also seen in the genuine Priestly narratives of Gen-Ex, such as in Exod 6:6-8 and Gen 17:9-14. Thus the H-composition in Gen-Exod and the H legislation in Lev 17-26 both have a genuine use of language similar to Deuteronomy.⁵⁶

3.5. The Question of Profane vs. Sacred Slaughter

It is further argued that in Lev 17 H revises the P notion of the allowance of profane slaughter from Gen 9:3-6 in view of centralization in Deuteronomy 12.⁵⁷ Ac-

⁵⁴ Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 152; cf. already Wellhausen, *Composition*, 149-150.

⁵⁵ Otto, "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 9n43; 10n45; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 27-30.

⁵⁶ So for Ruwe, the presence of Deuteronomic or non-Priestly language cannot be used as a criteria to distinguish between P and H (*'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 33).

⁵⁷ Already Wurster ("Zur Charakteristik und Geschichte," 120), Bertholet (*Leviticus*, 57), and Baentsch (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, 22n1) argue for the incoherence between the views of slaughter in Gen 9 and Lev 17:3-4, and recently Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*, 177; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 241; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 411-13. According to these scholars, the laws of Lev 17 are a critical revision of profane slaughter in D and P. Whether or not Lev 17 is an intentional revision of D does not however affect the consideration of it as integrally connected

cording to Gen 9:3-4, every living thing (רמש חי) is permitted for consumption for post-flood humanity, with the only limitation placed against the consumption of blood (בשר בנפשו דמו). The legislation continues in Gen 9:5-6 by regulating a talion punishment against murder of humans: שפך דם האדם באדם דמו ישפך. According to Lev 17:4-5, slaughtering an ox, lamb, or goat and not bringing it to the tent of meeting is equated with the murder of a human, expressed in terms from Gen 9:6 (דם יחשב לאיש), which leads to the כרת penalty. As argued by Blum, Ruwe, and Crüsemann, these texts are to be understood as developing the notion of the restoration of creation within the Priestly composition, for which Lev 17 is an essential component. In the narrative situation of Gen 9 profane slaughter does not exist, since the alternative of sacral slaughter did not exist yet, and therefore Gen 9 and Lev 17 cannot be in contradiction.⁵⁸ According to the original creation in the Priestly narrative, humans were limited to a vegetarian diet in peaceful co-existence with animals (Gen 1:29-30).⁵⁹ Following the in-breaking of violence into the world and the ensuing flood, God places boundaries on violence against the animal world and humanity (Gen 9:4-6). With the restoration of the presence of God among Israel in the sanctuary and the sanctification of Israel as a place for YHWH in the world as seen in the program of Lev 17-26, the limitation of slaughter to the cultic realm in Lev 17 "steht damit deutlich im Zusammenhang mit dem kosmologischen Grundproblem der priesterlichen Urgeschichte, nämlich der in der Tiertötung thematisierten Gewaltprob-

to the inner logic of the Priestly composition developing from Gen 9:3-6.

⁵⁸ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 335n10; cf. Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 278, 291-293. So already Dillmann, *Exodus-Leviticus*, 585. The objections of Wurster ("Zur Charakteristik und Geschichte," 120) and Baentsch (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, 22n1) do not take into account the significance of narrative development within the Priestly narrative.

⁵⁹ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 289-290; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 61-62, 413. Nihan agrees with this understanding of the development of dietary restrictions in the Priestly narrative as part of the restitution of creation, but contends that H "radicalizes" P and thus cannot be from the same strata (413).

lematik."⁶⁰ The significance of this concept for the H-composition is expressed in equating inappropriate killing of animals with the murder of humans. Violence against animals is limited to the cultic realm as dedicated to God (Lev 17:4-6), leading to the possibility of restoration of peaceful relations between humanity and creation (Lev 26:3-6).⁶¹

3.6. Passover Instructions in Exod 12 and Lev 23

Further, it is argued that the Passover instructions in Exod 12* contradict those in Lev 23:5-8, as the Lev 23 H festival calendar supposedly seeks to reconcile the P ritual of Exod 12 with the Deuteronomic instructions for the Passover in Deut 16.⁶² As is often noted however, the Passover instructions in Lev 23:4-5 are remarkably laconic. Lev 23:4-5 merely states that the Passover is counted among the *מועדי יהוה מקראי* (Lev 23:4), and that it takes place on the fourteenth day of the first month at twilight (*בין הערבים* Lev 23:5). The understanding of Exod 12* in itself is a complex issue, and how it relates more extensively to Lev 17-26 will be discussed further below. At this point however, it can be provisionally argued that there is no contradiction between the statements on the Passover in Exod 12 and Lev 23, and the absence of information on how to perform the Passover in Lev 23 can be explained by the presumption of the instructions from Exod 12* in Lev 23.⁶³ As noted by Grünwaldt,

⁶⁰ Ruwe, *Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 143. The dietary regulations in Lev 11 are also to be understood in this context (Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 323; Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," 101-106). Cf. also Roskop-Erisman, "Mythologizing Exile: Life, Law, and Justice after the Flood," 108-9; Arnold, "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative," 29.

⁶¹ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 325. It is possible however for humans to partake of meat as part of *שלמים* offerings, and also the meat of an animal that is *טרפה* or *נבלה* (Lev 17:5, 15-16).

⁶² Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237; "Innerbiblische Exegese," 154-57; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 153; Cholewinski, *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*, 214-215; Bertholet, *Leviticus*, 79.

⁶³ Cf. Elliger, *Leviticus*, 314. Several scholars considered Lev 23:5 part of P^G, such as Dillmann (*Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*, 639), Kuenen (*An Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 89), Feucht (*Untersuchungen*, 46), and Kilian (*Untersuchung*, 110). Milgrom (*Leviticus 23-27*, 1968), and

there is no contradiction between Lev 23 and P traditions of the Passover, though Lev 23:5-8 is a doublet that transforms Exod 12:1-20 by transferring the family festival to the central sanctuary.⁶⁴ This difference between the family festival in Exod 12 and the central sanctuary *מקרא קדש* in Lev 23 is not a contradiction that necessitates literary-critical distinction. The instructions in Exod 12:1-14 are for the family passover ritual of choosing and slaughtering the lamb and its consumption in the urgent circumstances of the Exodus from Egypt as necessitated by the narrative context, whereas Lev 23:5-8 is about the collective public aspect of the Passover as a communal celebration in the promised land. This difference in perspective is not a conceptual difference necessitating the presumption of incompatibility between them.⁶⁵

3.7. Theological Differences

Knohl and Milgrom have also postulated a series of differences between P and H.⁶⁶ The proposals of Knohl and Milgrom however are inconsistent in assigning materials to P or H. A pivotal issue here is the assignment of Exod 6:2-8 to H by both of these scholars, which is inextricably connected to previous Priestly texts such as Gen 1:1–2:4a; 17:1-27.⁶⁷ Knohl and Milgrom however are inconsistent when they consider the preceding Priestly narratives in Genesis, such as Gen 1:1–2:4a; 6-9*, and 17 as P/PT, as distinct from H in Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46.⁶⁸ So according to Knohl, the Priestly

Hoffmann (*Leviticus*, 7, 143-44) consider Exod 12:1-20 to be the presumed historical background of Lev 23:5-8. Knohl assigns Exod 12:1-20 to H (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 104).

⁶⁴ Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 129.

⁶⁵ Ruwe, *Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 30, 304-307; Blum, "Issues and Problems," 37n24; *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 336n10; Hoffmann, *Leviticus*, 7, 143-44.

⁶⁶ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 16-21.

⁶⁷ Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 104; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1343.

⁶⁸ Though Milgrom considers Gen 1:1–2:4a to be H ("H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33-40), this creates inconsistency in relation to Gen 17:1-27, which he considers P. Thomas King seeks to alleviate this problem by assigning the Genesis Priestly narratives to a Pn source, with the Priestly narratives following Exod 6:2 from H (*The Realignment of the Priestly Narratives*, 77-108, 125-151).

narratives (PT) in Genesis portray אלהים personally and anthropomorphically and as relating to humans through mutual covenants (ברית Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27), whereas in the Mosaic era PT eliminates all anthropomorphic notions of יהוה, who now encounters (יעד) Israel through the impersonal בבווד, and relates to Israel through a unilateral עדות pact.⁶⁹ Knohl then contends that H however rejects the PT notion of an impersonal God in the Sinai era, where H re-affirms the PT notion of an anthropomorphic, direct, active, and personal God seen in the Genesis PT narratives. According to H, YHWH relates to Israel again through a bi-lateral ברית and addresses Israel in first person, as in the Genesis PT theology.⁷⁰ Given the fact that the central text that describes the progressive revelation from אלהים to אל שדי to יהוה (Exod 6:2-8) is of H origin, and the fact that it is inextricably linked to the preceding Priestly narratives in Genesis, a better solution than Knohl's would be to consider all of the texts that reflect a consistent anthropomorphic notion of God, the gradual revelation of the name of God (Exod 6:2-8), and the sequence of bi-lateral covenants (Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; Lev 26) as H texts. Rather than seeing Knohl's impersonal PT at Sinai as a radical departure from an anthropomorphic PT theology in Genesis, with H then returning to the Genesis PT anthropomorphic theology, the impersonal PT Sinai theology is better understood as the use of traditions that reflect a different Priestly perspective, primarily seen in Exod 25-29* and other ritual texts within Ex-Lev-Num, within a consistently anthropomorphic H-theology seen in the composition spanning from Gen 1-Lev 26. Based on ritual texts in Exod 25-Lev-Num which Knohl assigns to PT, he develops further his opposition between PT and HS,

⁶⁹ Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 125-136.

⁷⁰ Ibid., 168-170.

such as in differences between rewards and punishments, and the separation of morality and the cult.⁷¹

Milgrom follows Knohl in many regards, proposing that a characteristic feature of H is first-person divine speech directed to the addressee in second person, and Milgrom likewise contends that P makes an effort to avoid anthropomorphism.⁷² This however is the same divine address and theology reflected in what he considers as P texts in Gen 9, 17.⁷³ Milgrom is nevertheless open to considering H material in Genesis, such as with Gen 1:1–2:4a, and he sees the election of Israel as holy for YHWH as expressed in H as a natural continuation and climax of the process of creation.⁷⁴ The natural consequence of assigning Gen 1:1–2:4a, as well as Exod 6:2-8; 29:38-46 to H as Milgrom does however is the assignment of all of these Priestly narratives in Genesis to H.⁷⁵

The remaining proposed differences between the P^G narrative and Lev 17-26 pertain to cultic differences.⁷⁶ Following this analysis of the proposed inconsistencies

⁷¹ Ibid., 174-75.

⁷² Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 59; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1326. As noted by Milgrom however, for both P and H, Moses is the mediator of divine speech (*Leviticus 17-22*, 1434). Milgrom is also less certain than Knohl on using first-person address as a criteria for determining between H and P (*Leviticus 1-16*, 17), and rejects Knohl's view that P is averse to describing YHWH as dwelling among Israel, specifically assigning Exod 24:15-18; 40:35-36 to P, in contrast to Knohl's H assignment (*Leviticus 1-16*, 58-59). Milgrom further considers the problematic nature of anthropomorphism as a criteria to distinguish between P and H in taking Gen 1:1–2:4a as H, which contains extensive anthropomorphism, while still considering Gen 9* as P, which also contains anthropomorphism ("H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33n35).

⁷³ Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 15.

⁷⁴ Milgrom, "H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33-39; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1412.

⁷⁵ Milgrom does hint at this possibility, cf. *ibid.*, 1443.

⁷⁶ Most of the differences between P and H proposed by Knohl and Milgrom are differences in the understanding of the cult in P and H (Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 35-38; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1325-26, 1349-55). As noted by Nihan, there is a process of revision and expansion that generates terminological and conceptual distinctions within the Priestly literature ("The Priestly Covenant," 87-88; *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 546). Likewise for Baentsch (*Leviticus*, 388-89, 404-405, 411) and Bertholet (*Leviticus*, XV), differences between P and H are also found in cultic matters, in Lev 17, 21-22, and 23. As noted in the critiques of Knohl and Milgrom by Blum ("Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate," 33-39) and Ruwe (*Heiligkeitsetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 32), these differences pertain only to cultic matters, and reflect nuances of expression indicating use of various cultic traditions. Grünwaldt finds no contradictions with P in Lev 17-20, 23-25. Only in Lev 21-22 does

between the P^G narrative and H, it can be affirmed that there are no contradictions between the P^G narrative and the characteristic H material in Lev 17-26 that would require assigning them to different sources due to incoherence between them. This leaves open the possibility that there can be considered integral connections between the P^G narrative and the characteristic H material, and thus these can be considered a unified H composition.

Now that the objections against the coherence of P^G and H have been addressed, a positive case can be made for the coherence of P^G and H. I will first outline the main themes of the logically developing Priestly narrative in Genesis and Exodus. From here it will be shown how beginning with Gen 1:1–2:4a the Priestly narrative provides the narrative foundation which the legislation of the Holiness Code is grounded in. Thus the Priestly narratives of Gen-Exod will be shown to be a necessary foundation for the Holiness Code, as part of what can fittingly be called the Holiness Composition.

he consider there to be slight differences with other Priestly laws (*Heiligkeitgesetz*, 129-130).

Chapter 4

Genesis 1:1-2:4a as "Holiness Preamble": Analysis of Genesis 1:1-2:4a

Thus the Holy One, blessed be He, consulted Torah,
as He created the world

כך היה הקב"ה מביט בתורה
ובורא את העולם
Gen. Rab. 1:1

"...das Geschichtliche ist nur das Beiwerk, das Gesetzliche das Wesentliche. So ist die ganze Vorgeschichte kurz gefasst, zur Erläuterung des Entstehens jenes gesetzlichen Zustandes" (Theodore Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 108).

"Das Gesetz ist der Schlüssel zum Verständnis auch der Erzählung des Priesterkodex. Mit der Einwirkung des Gesetzes hängen alle unterscheidenden Eigentümlichkeiten derselben zusammen; überall macht sich die Theorie, die Regel, das Urteil geltend" (Julius Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 383-84).

Any theory of the purpose and extent of the Priestly narratives must determine the function of Gen 1:1-2:4a as the beginning of the narrative, which sets the parameters and context for all that follows to be understood. Genesis 1:1-2:4a describes the "ethos of the cosmos" in which the Priestly narrative unfolds, exhibiting the fundamental values for the formation of a community's identity, worldview, and ethics.¹ As noted in the history of research, several scholars have proposed that this ethos is intended to provide the foundation for the values of the Holiness Code legislation.² Genesis 1:1-2:4a can be considered as the beginning of the H composition from two points that can be firmly established. As noted already by Nöldeke, a central purpose of Gen 1:1-2:4a is to establish foundations for ritual ordinances, especially with regards to the Sabbath and festivals.³ These two concerns point to the H provenance of Gen 1:1-2:4a.

¹ William P. Brown, *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 12; Mark S. Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010), 1-4.

² Amit, "הבריאה ולוח הקדושה"; Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble"; Cooper and Goldstein, "The Development of the Priestly Calendars (I)"; Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda"; Milgrom, "H_P in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah"; Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitsgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'.

³ Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 9.

It is commonly affirmed that two central features of the Holiness Code in Lev 17-26 are its emphasis on the Sabbath (שבת) and holiness (קדש).⁴ These terms are combined in Gen 2:3: ויברך אלהים את יום השביעי ויקדש אתו כי בו שבת מכל מלאכתו. The roots שבת and קדש are found in close connection further in Exod 16:23; 20:8-11; 31:13-17; 35:2 and in Lev 17-26. Each of these texts in Exodus are often considered secondary to the *Grundschrift* of P and assigned to P^s or H, as the roots שבת and קדש are otherwise uncharacteristic of what is considered P^G.⁵ Sometimes Gen 2:2-3 is also considered secondary within Gen 1:1–2:4a,⁶ but this view can be rejected based on the importance of the motif of rest in parallel ancient Near Eastern creation accounts,⁷ the climactic importance of the seventh day, without which the creation week would be incomplete,⁸ and because a creation account that does not include the seventh day as a climactic day of rest cannot be coherently reconstructed from Gen 1:1–2:4a.⁹ If Gen 2:2-3 is essential for the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:4a, and these constitutive terms do not occur elsewhere in P^G, this would create the problem of Gen 2:2-3 introducing the motif of ceasing from work (שבת) on a sanctified day (קדש) as a "blind

⁴ Knohl, *The Sanctuary of Silence*, 189-192; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1397-1400; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 237-240; Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift,' 90-103.

⁵ The root קדש is only found in Exod 29:43-44 among texts that are traditionally considered part of the Priestly *Grundschrift*. Knohl and Milgrom assign this text to H (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 104; *Leviticus 17-22*, 1338), whereas it is considered the climactic ending of P^G by Otto ("Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 26-27), and secondary by Pola (*Die Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 309, 325). See Thomas Krüger, "Genesis 1:1–2:3 and the Development of the Pentateuch," in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (eds. Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 130-31, for a consideration of all of Gen 2:2-3; Exod 20:8-11; 31:13-17 as secondary to the Priestly *Grundschrift*.

⁶ So Krüger, "Genesis 1:1–2:3 and the Development of the Pentateuch," 130-31. As noted by Krüger however the current scholarly discussion prefers a unifying reading of the text; cf. Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 175-76.

⁷ Moshe Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord - The Problem of the Sitz im Leben of Genesis 1:1–2:3," in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles* (eds. André Caquot and Mathias Delcor; AOAT 212; Kevelaer: Butzon&Bercker; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1981), 501-502; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 159.

⁸ Milgrom, "HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33-34.

⁹ Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift*, 178-99; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 158n7.

motif" that is prominently introduced, but not further developed or explained in the narrative.¹⁰ The solution to this problem is that all of these Sabbath texts, beginning with Gen 2:2-3 and continuing in Exod 16:23; 20:8-11; 31:13-17; 35:1-3 originate in the H school as a coherent system of gradual revelation of the Sabbath in the world.¹¹ Not only is the specific language and theology of Gen 1:1–2:4a fitting for H, but it can be argued that the intention of Gen 1:1–2:4a is to function as a "Holiness Preamble," that is the foundation for the laws of Lev 17-26, most prominently in this case for the Sabbath theology of H.¹² Thus the criteria for assigning texts like Gen 1:1–2:4a to the H composition is based on linguistic, theological, and conceptual coherence with the characteristic H material in Lev 17-26, and also decisively from a demonstrable function to prepare the foundations for the H Torah of Lev 17-26.

Genesis 2:2-3 does not contain a command for humans to keep the Sabbath, but it does present אלהים as the creator of the world sanctifying (קדש) and resting or ceasing from work (שבת) on the seventh day.¹³ God thus establishes the seventh day

¹⁰ A blind motif is a motif that the narrative clearly indicates is of significant importance, but its meaning is never explained in the course of the narrative. It is unlikely that Gen 2:2-3 would introduce such a prominent motif as a climax of the creation account that is not further developed in the narrative (Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift*, 190-191n808).

¹¹ Klostermann already recognized the connection between Gen 2:2-3 and the Holiness Code ("Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," 375); cf. Milgrom, "H_P in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 33-40; Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 334-36. As noted by Jeffrey Stackert, "The suggestion that the Priestly creation story [Gen 1:1–2:4a] is H and not P creates significant problems for understanding P as a whole and provides a push down the slippery slope toward reassigning all of the P narrative to H" ("Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath," 8n26). As I am contending here, this indeed is the best understanding of Gen 1:1–2:4a as the beginning of the H composition, with the logical outcome being "reassigning all of the P narrative to H."

¹² Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 334-36.

¹³ For this reason scholars such as Weimar (*Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 132-33) and Janowski ("Tempel und Schöpfung," 234-38) see no connection between Gen 2:2-3 and the Sabbath commands in Torah, understanding it rather as connected with the sequence of 6 + 1 days that are associated with building the sanctuary in Exod 24:15-18. Against this however speaks the fact that Gen 2:2-3 contains terms that occur in Sabbath law texts such as מלאכה, קדש, שבת, which an ancient Israelite would hardly have failed to associate with the Sabbath laws (Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift*, 190; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 159-161; W.H. Schmidt, *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift. Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Genesis 1:1-2:4a und 2:4b-3:24* [2nd ed.; WMANT 17; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchen, 1967], 156).

as sacred, and exemplarily follows the ordinance of sanctifying the seventh day and resting from work as it would later be revealed to Israel in the Sabbath commands.¹⁴ The anthropomorphism indicated in this notion of God keeping the Sabbath is consistent with the theology of H and presupposed in the H parenthesis to imitate YHWH (Lev 19:2-3). The subsequent Sabbath texts in Exod 16; 20:8-11; 31:13-17 can be read as a coherent narrative development of Israel "discovering" the Sabbath grounded in creation (Exod 16), receiving the Sabbath as a command in Exod 20:8-11, and receiving the Sabbath as a sign of the Sinai covenant and their sanctity (Exod 31:13-17), as part of the foundational narrative of the H composition, building up to the prominence of the Sabbath which permeates all of life in the H Torah of Lev 17-26.¹⁵ It is specifically in the Holiness Code where Israel is called to imitate YHWH and be holy as YHWH is holy, with observance of the Sabbath as fundamental to this imitation (Lev 19:2-3).

In addition to laying the grounds for future observance of the Sabbath, Gen 1:14 describes the purpose of the celestial bodies as functioning as signs for "appointed times" (מועדים) for festivals that are linked to an astronomical calendar.¹⁶ The only place in the Torah where the term מועדים is used for festivals is in the H festival calendar in Lev 23:2, 4, 37, 44.¹⁷ If the מועדים in Gen 1:14 is not intended to establish the

¹⁴ Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift*, 191; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 158.

¹⁵ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 261; Milgrom, "H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 39; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 299-300; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 159; Cooper and Goldstein, "The Development of the Priestly Calendars (I)," 11; Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 47-49.

¹⁶ Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 38-39.

¹⁷ Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 339-341. This connection is noted by Bertholet, *Leviticus*, 79; Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 98; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 1955; Hartley, *Leviticus*, 375; and Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 295-96. Other occurrences of מועד associated with festivals are in Exod 23:15, where the feast of Unleavened Bread is to be kept at its time (מועד) in the month of Aviv, Num 9*, where there is concern for making the proper sacrifices at the appropriate time during Passover (במועד), Num 10:10; 15:13 a mention of undetermined מועדים, and Num 28:2; 29:39, where certain rituals are to be presented at their proper times (במועד). The focus of the use of מועד in the calendar in Numbers 28-29 is on performing the proper rites at the appointed times, rather than determining what the מועדי יהוה are as in Lev 23. The concern of Gen 1:14 thus points to Lev 23 as the

grounds for the מועדי יהוה in Lev 23, then it also constitutes a "blind motif" that is introduced prominently, but not developed elsewhere. The connection between the festivals and Sabbath in Gen 1:14 and 2:1-4a further solidifies the link to the H festival calendar in Lev 23:1-4, where the festivals are closely associated with the Sabbath.

In addition to Gen 1:1–2:4a providing the foundations for obedience to the Sabbath laws and festivals, the manner in which the world is created by God through separations, distinctions, and ordering is also formative for the laws of the Holiness Code. This is demonstrated by Andreas Ruwe, who shows that the rationales of the laws of Lev 17-25 consist of the same principles of "Trennung/Scheidung und Zuordnung" that God uses in the original creation.¹⁸ The laws of Lev 17-25 can be summarized under the heading of keeping the Sabbath and revering the sanctuary (את שבתתי) תשמרו ומקדשי תיראו Lev 19:30; 26:2),¹⁹ with Lev 17:1-22:33 focused on laws that constitute revering the sanctuary, and Lev 23:1-25:55 laws relating to honoring the Sabbath.²⁰ Observing the Sabbath and revering the sanctuary creates sacred space and time, which constitutes the partial restitution of the conditions of original creation, enabling the presence of God to dwell among Israel.²¹ As Israel imitates the holiness of YHWH by keeping the commands that revere the sanctuary and observe the Sabbath (קדשים תהיו כי קדוש אני Lev 19:2), they are imitating the process of making separations, distinctions, and order in the world by which God created and ordered the

only possible text that develops the theme of what the מועדים are.

¹⁸ Ruwe, *Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 103-120. See also Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 345, 395, for the importance of Gen 1:1–2:4a creation theology in the laws of H.

¹⁹ Ruwe, *Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 90-103; Bertholet, *Leviticus*, XV; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 240. According to Otto, Lev 26:2 with 19:3, 30 combine the two main parts of Lev 17-26 into a statement regarding honoring the sanctuary and observing the Sabbath. Lev 17-22:33 is a combination of laws on the cult, justice, and ethics, pointedly expressed in the prohibition of idolatry, and Lev 23-25 is structured and characterized by the Sabbath command in 23:3.

²⁰ The conception of the Sabbath permeates all of the laws in Lev 23-25 (Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 240).

²¹ Ruwe, *Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 115-120.

world, and thus participating in the restitution of the conditions of creation. Thus Gen 1:1–2:4a provides the foundations for obedience to all of the laws of Lev 17-25 by modeling the task that Israel are to follow in imitation of God in obedience to the laws of the Holiness Code.²²

It was already shown in the discussion of ברית in the H composition above (Chapter 3) how the blessings of creation in Gen 1:26-28 (פרה, רבה) are the starting point for the series of developing ברית statements including Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 1:7; 2:23-25; 6:2-8; 29:42-46; 31:13-17, and culminating in Leviticus 26:9-13. Following the laws of Lev 17-25, which demand observing the Sabbath (שבת) and revering the sanctuary (מקדש) as part of the process of making distinctions, separations, and ordering that enables the restitution of creation and the presence of God among Israel, Lev 26 is the logical culmination of Gen 1:1–2:4a, as the actualization and parenthesis of the creation blessings to the current generation.²³ The creation account in Gen 1:1–2:4a is thus the "Holiness Preamble" for the H composition, which also contains central ברית texts in Gen 9:1-17 and 17:1-27,²⁴ Priestly texts in Exodus,

²² Significant in this regard is also the concept of humanity being created in the image of God. As developed by Edwin Firmage, being in the image of God at least implies the ability to be like God and imitate God in the function of ruling over creation (Gen 1:26-28). This also foundational for Israel's potential to be holy as YHWH is holy (Lev 19:2), through making the proper distinctions and separations in the world. In Lev 11:44-45 (H) this injunction implies observing dietary laws that can be understood as imitating God's diet (Firmage, "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," 101-106; Arnold, "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble," 336-338). On the imitation of God as foundational for the ethics of holiness in H, see Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 173; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1398, 1438, 1722, 1761-62.

²³ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 325-26.

²⁴ Bill T. Arnold and Angela Roskop-Erisman have contended for the Priestly material in Gen 6-9* being an H composition (Arnold, "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative [Genesis 6:9-9:29]," 13-41; Roskop-Erisman, "Mythologizing Exile: Life, Law, and Justice after the Flood," 108-109). Regarding Genesis 17, scholars such as Knohl (Gen 17:7-8, 14 [*Sanctuary of Silence*, 102-104]), Olyan (Gen 17:8b, 10, 11-12, 13b, 14 [*Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of the Cult* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000), 152-154]), Wöhrle (Gen 17:9-14, 23-27 ["The Integrative Function of the Law of Circumcision," in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East* (eds. R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011), 81-84]) and Mark Brett (following Wöhrle, Gen 17:9-14, 23-27; ["The Priestly Dissemination of Abraham," *HeBAI* 3 (2014): 90]) have proposed that various portions of it are of H origins. Taking portions of Gen 17 as H however raises the question of the unity

and climaxing in Lev 26. The H-narratives in Genesis form the foundations for the H laws in Lev 17-25 and covenant parenthesis in Lev 26, as part of the H composition that integrates narrative and law in order to form the theological and philosophical underpinnings of the H laws and thus present the rationales and motivate obedience to the H laws for Israel to maintain its responsibility to the *ברית*.

Establishing the function of Gen 1:1–2:4a as the "Holiness Preamble" points to all subsequent Priestly narratives that continue the plot of Gen 1:1–2:4a further as also being part of the H composition. Arnold and others have already developed how further Priestly texts in Genesis function as part of the H composition to inculcate obedience to the laws of H and commitment to the *ברית*.²⁵ The Priestly narratives function as Nöldeke argued "zur Erläuterung des Entstehens jenes gesetzlichen Zustandes."²⁶ Similarly Wellhausen stated, "Das Gesetz ist der Schlüssel zum Verständ-

of the chapter. Scholars such as Weimar (*Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 185-200), and Grünwaldt (*Exil und Identität*, 18-62) have proposed complex models of redactional development of the chapter from an original kernel. Their criteria for carving up the chapter however are questionable and unpersuasive. Often the criteria for removing portions of Gen 17 as secondary is due to the presence of language similar characteristic of H (Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 190-91). If the chapter is understood however as an H composition, this approach is flawed, and the chapter can be read as a unified coherent composition, which is the view of most scholars today, such as Konrad Schmid (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 238-240), Albert de Pury ("Pg as the Absolute Beginning," 109), Sean McEvenue (*The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer* [AnBib 50; Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971], 145-160), Christophe Nihan (apart from 17:14; "The Priestly Covenant," 98-102), Frank Crüsemann (*The Torah*, 294-95), Norbert Lohfink ("The Priestly Narrative and History," 145), David Carr (*Reading the Fractures of Genesis*, 82-85), and Benjamin Ziemer (*Abram-Abraham*, 374-376). As noted by Schmid, Gen 17 forms a unified concentric structure with vv.9-14 as its center, containing the command that is being emphasized in its center (*Genesis and the Moses Story*, 238-240; cf. also the structural observations by McEvenue, *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*, 145-160; Erhard Blum, *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte* [WMANT 57; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1984], 420-22; and Fox, "The Sign of the Covenant," 589). This is coincidentally the same concentric structure that is seen in the Sabbath covenant sign text in Exod 31:12-17, which is assigned to H. As proposed by Arnold, since Gen 17 is unified with the H-like portions essential to its structure, the chapter can be read as consistent with the H composition development of the theme of the covenant (*Genesis*, 167-174). See also Benjamin Ziemer, who assigns the text to the Pentateuchal redaction on the same level with Exod 31:13-17 (*Abram-Abraham*, 375).

²⁵ Arnold, *Genesis*, passim.; Roskop-Erisman, "Mythologizing Exile: Life, Law, and Justice after the Flood," 108-109. See also Milgrom ("HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 29-40), Meg Warner, who argues that the work of H redactors is seen in Gen 18:17-19; 22:15-18, and 26:3b-5 (*And I Will Remember my Covenant with Abraham: The Holiness School in Genesis*, 1-42), and Mark Brett, who suggests an extensive presence of H material in Genesis ("The Priestly Dissemination of Abraham," 106-107).

²⁶ Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 108.

nis auch der Erzählung des Priesterkodex. Mit der Einwirkung des Gesetzes hängen alle unterscheidenden Eigentümlichkeiten derselben zusammen; überall macht sich die Theorie, die Regel, das Urteil geltend."²⁷ Nöldeke and Wellhausen contended that the P^G narrative was foundational for the Priestly laws, generally focusing on cultic laws. No attention was given however to the possibility that the P^G narrative is rather foundational for the legislation of the Holiness Code. More recently, Simeon Chavel's study of Lev 24:10-23; Num 9:1-14; 15:32-36; and 27:1-11 shows how law and narrative are intertwined in what Chavel calls priestly "oracular novellas."²⁸ Chavel contends that "One should not underestimate the significance of the nexus of law and narrative to the oracular novellas, to the Priestly history, to priestly life and conceptualization, or as a formative aspect of societies at large."²⁹ As proposed by Chavel, the Priestly narratives form a normative world that is imbued with Torah:

One may say that the Priestly work brings law and narrative into mutual relation more richly, continuously, and organically than do the others [Pentateuchal sources]. It weaves a legal, legislative strand into the fabric of the history it narrates, and accentuates the strand at critical junctures that alter the patterns of history as it unfolds....On the cosmic plane, the universe itself pulsates with legal potency from its very inception. The deity - as Elohim - first establishes the character of procreation, sustenance and diet, even time (Gen 1:26-30 and 2:1-3). Subsequently he recasts these features of existence as matters of law and obedience, first for all humanity...then for the descendants of Abraham (Gen 17). Ultimately...he reifies them as full-blown, fully articulated law for Israel specifically.³⁰

As I am arguing here, this "full-blown, fully articulated law" that the Priestly narratives are pointing towards is the Holiness Code. Thus not only the Priestly laws in Ex-

²⁷ Wellhausen, *Prolegomena*, 383-84.

²⁸ Simeon Chavel, *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah* (FAT II.71; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 265.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 268-69. Cf. also the work of Wolfgang Oswald on the non-Priestly Exod 1-24 as a "founding document" with narrative and law linked for the purpose of grounding the legal ordinances and covenant from Exod 20-24 ("Die Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung als Gründungsurkunde der jüdischen Bürgergemeinde," in *Law and Narrative in the Bible and in the Neighboring Ancient Cultures* [eds. Klaus-Peter Adam, Friedrich Avemarie, and Nili Wazana; FAT II.54; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012], 35-51).

Lev, but also the narratives in Gen-Exod should be seen as a foundational part of the development of the legal program of H. The Priestly narratives in Gen-Exod form the normative world of the laws of the Holiness Code and inculcate the required conditions, attitudes, and emotions to sustain the ethical demands of the Holiness Code. As developed by Terence Fretheim, the narrativity of biblical law functions to highlight the theological foundations of law, as well as to instruct Israel in obedience to the law.³¹ The narratives develop a portrait of God as the subject who stands behind the law, which law is a gift of God's graciousness that enables a relationship with God. The narrative also models and motivates Israel to keep the law, as instruction that is not abstract, but integrated with the very identity and life of Israel. The combination of narrative and law thus allows Torah to function as instruction that shapes the life of Israel.

Having refuted the arguments for the literary-critical distinction between the Priestly narrative (P^G) and H laws (chapter 3), and having made a positive case for how Gen 1:1–2:4a functions as a "Holiness Preamble," and hence all subsequent Priestly narratives in Genesis are best understood as part of the H composition, I will now turn to analyze the Priestly texts in Exodus and make a positive case for their belonging to the H composition as well. Though it has often been noted that key Priestly texts in Exod 6:2–8; 29:43–46, and Exod 31:12–17 have language that resembles H, the case for them belonging to H has not been settled. I will make a positive case for understanding them as integral theological and motivational foundations for the laws of Lev 17–25 and the exhortation in Lev 26. This will confirm what was stated by Nöldeke regarding the Priestly narrative: its nature is to use narratives to inculcate the

³¹ *Exodus* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 201–207.

Priestly laws.³² As I will argue, the Priestly narrative is best understood as an H-composition, intended to inculcate the H legislation. The Priestly texts of Exodus develop the foundational H composition themes from Genesis, such as creation theology and the covenant, but add to these two important themes that likewise permeate the H laws and covenant theology: the revelation of the name YHWH to Israel resulting in the Exodus event (Exod 1-14), and the subsequent indwelling of YHWH among Israel and the demand for holiness (Exod 16-40).

The analysis of the Priestly texts will be divided into two sections: Egypt (Exod 1-14) and wilderness/Sinai (Exod 16-40). Each of these sections contain narratives that constitute the backbone of the H composition in Exodus. These texts will be identified based on the presence of H language, as well as a function that is consistent with the H composition in Genesis and which establishes the foundations for H legislation and theology in Lev 17-26. These chapters will also consider how H has integrated Priestly and non-Priestly traditions into the overarching H composition from Gen 1-Lev 26.

³²Nöldeke, *Untersuchungen*, 62, 108.

Chapter 5

The Holiness Composition in Exodus 1-14: You shall know that I am YHWH

5.1 Introduction to the Priestly texts in Exodus 1-14

From the time of the classic identification of the Priestly literature by Nöldeke, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, there has been widespread agreement over its broad contours within the book of Exodus.¹ Traditionally, Exod 1:1-5, 7, 13-14; 2:23a-25; 6:2-7:13; 7:19-20a, 21b-22; 8:1-3, 12-15; 9:8-12; 11:9-10; 12:1-20, 28, 43-51; and 14* have been considered part of the Priestly narrative. Recent studies by Jan Christian Gertz and Christoph Berner have argued that the texts of Exodus developed in a process of gradual supplementing, and this approach has brought an increasing scrutiny of the strata and character of the Priestly writings in Exodus.² Despite the demise of the concept of continuous J- and E-sources as defined by the Documentary Hypothesis, the view of a continuous Priestly narrative that encompasses at least material in Genesis and Exodus has been maintained. This chapter will analyze the character of the Priestly narrative in Exodus in order to investigate its relationship to the Holiness Code. The analysis will proceed in three steps:

¹ Cf. the chart in Holzinger, *Einleitung*, 517. A few scholars such as Jacob (*The Second Book of the Bible: Exodus, Interpreted by Benno Jacob* [trans. Walter Jacob; Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1992]) and Fischer ("Exodus 1-15: Eine Erzählung," in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction-Reception-Interpretation* [ed. Marc Vervenne; BETL 126; Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996], 149-150; Fischer and Markl, *Das Buch Exodus* [NSKAT 2; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2009], 20) deny the presence of sources in the Exodus narrative due to its high level of coherence. This coherence however can also be explained as the result of a redactor who has shaped the narrative into a coherent unity.

² Jan Christian Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch* (FRLANT 186; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2000); Berner, *Die Exoduserzählung*; cf. also the contributions in *A Farewell to the Yahwist?: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (eds. Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid; SBL Symp 34 [Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006]); Thomas Dozeman, *Exodus* (ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009). For a recent state of the discussion on the Priestly texts, see the contributions in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. Sarah Shectman and Joel Baden; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009) and *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte* (eds. Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid; VWGTH 40; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015).

First, I will identify the Priestly *Grundschrift* narrative in Exod 1-14. Several detailed studies of the identification of the Priestly texts in Exodus have appeared in the last twenty years, and there is no need to undertake a comprehensive new assessment.³ The identification of the base layer of the Priestly texts will follow largely based on what is commonly agreed upon to be P^G, but also following the arguments developed by Christoph Berner modified at certain points. More extensively I will argue for departing from generally held views in Exodus 12. The result of the analysis will distinguish three layers of material within the Priestly literature of Exodus 1-14: 1) a base-layer (traditionally P^G) which I will contend is aligned with the Holiness Code, and thus part of the H-composition, which pre-supposes non-Priestly materials in Exod 1-14; 2) Priestly supplements, primarily in Exod 1:1-5*; 6:13-30; 7:8-11:10*, which accentuate themes already present in the base narrative, or establish the authority of Aaron as a foundation for the role of Aaron in the Tabernacle and cultic texts in Exod 25-Lev 16*, and 3) H-supplements that represent a later stage of material from the Holiness school, which were added primarily in Exod 12:15-20, 43-49 as a response to the Deuteronomic ritual developments in Exod 12-13*.

The second stage of investigation will consider how the base layer of the Priestly texts relates to and functions in its surroundings. What is the character of the Priestly narratives? How do the Priestly texts advance the storyline? What is the purpose of their addition in relation to the non-Priestly texts? Understanding the function of the Priestly texts in their context will support the proposal that they are better un-

³ In addition to the works of Gertz and Berner mentioned above, see also Fujiko Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3-14* (BZAW 166; Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986); Thomas Römer, "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document," "Von Moses Berufung zur Spaltung des Meers: Überlegungen zur priesterschriftlichen Version der Exoduserzählung," in *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte* (eds. Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid; VWGTH 40; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015), 134-160; and Jaeyoung Jeon, *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story* (FAT II/60; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013).

derstood as H-texts, as their function is to establish the foundations for the laws of the Holiness Code.

Thirdly, I will consider how the identified Priestly narratives relate to the laws of the Holiness Code. This section will build on the conclusion argued for in chapter 3 above, that there are no inconsistencies between the Priestly narrative and the Holiness Code, by showing that the Priestly narrative can justifiably be seen as foundational to the Holiness Code as part of an H-composition that provides the narrative foundations that motivate and establish the grounds for obedience to the laws in the Holiness Code. The identification of the Priestly narrative with H will be made based on H-language and a function to support H laws.

The initial perspective of reading the Priestly narrative as a composition that is integrally linked to the Holiness Code will impact the criteria by which texts are considered part of the base Priestly narrative that is identified with the H-composition, just as scholars who consider P^G and H to be distinct reflect this difference in their exegesis. This is seen for example in Gen 17, where parts that resemble the language of H in vv.9-14 are often removed as secondary, but nevertheless the chapter can also be read as a coherent unity if the criteria of removing H-like material as secondary is rejected. Based on the establishment of Gen 1:1–2:4a as a foundational text for the Holiness Code, it is justified to begin an analysis of the Priestly texts in Exodus with the starting point of considering the possibility that the Priestly narrative is likewise consistent with and functioning as part of the Holiness Code. In the textual analysis, this judgment will have an impact particularly in the assessment of the layers of Exodus 12. If the possibility is considered from the outset that the base Priestly narrative could belong to the strata of the Holiness Code and is intended to establish the foundations of the laws for the Holiness Code, I will not be inclined to remove material

that aligns with the Holiness Code as secondary when there are no compelling syntactical grounds to do so, as is usually done in discussions of Exodus 12 for example.

5.2 The Priestly Base-layer in Exodus 1-14

5.2.1 Exodus 1-2

Within Exod 1-2, traditionally 1:1-5, 7, 13-14; 2:23aβ-25 have been identified as Priestly texts. There is some question about whether the genealogical list in 1:1-5 belongs to the earliest Priestly narrative due to its dependence on both the Priestly genealogy in Gen 35:22b-26 and what is considered a post-Priestly list of Jacob's descendants who wandered into Egypt in Gen 46:8-27.⁴ Due to this it should be considered a later addition, which emphasizes the smallness of Israel in entering Egypt, and thus highlights the magnitude of their proliferation in 1:7. Exodus 1:7 should be maintained as part of the Priestly base narrative, despite its use of ויעצמו that is encountered in the non-P narrative in 1:9, 20.⁵ The statement ובני ישראל פרו וישרצו וירבו ויעצמו (Exod 1:7) is linked in almost every word to key Priestly narratives in Genesis.⁶ The verbs פרה and רבה describe the fulfillment of the Priestly creational blessing in Gen 1:22, 28; 9:1, 7; 35:11; 47:27 in Israel's becoming a nation

⁴ Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 38-41; "Die Literarische Character der Priesterschrift in der Exoduserzählung (Exod 1-14)," in *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte*, (eds. Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid; VWGTH 40; Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015), 96-97; Levin, *Der Jahwist* [FRLANT 157; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1993], 315; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 354-357. According to Erhard Blum, Rainer Albertz, Wolfgang Oswald and Helmut Utzschneider, 1:1-5 are an integral part of the P-composition (Blum, *Verbindung*, 149ff; Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 43; Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15* [IECOT; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014], 57). Werner Schmidt argues that 1:1-5 are required as part of the Priestly narrative since 1:7 would be an unfitting opening for P (*Exodus 1-7* [BK 2.1; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1988], 11). This concern however is ameliorated if the Priestly narrative presupposes the non-P narrative.

⁵ Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 352-353; Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 39. Arguing for a later assignment are Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 15; Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 315; and Propp, *Exodus 1-18* [AB 2A; New York: Doubleday, 1999], 125-27, who assigns it to RP. Schmidt removes ויעצמו as from RP (*Exodus*, 12). Dillmann (*Exodus-Levitikus*, 3) and Beer and Galling (*Exodus* [HAT 3; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1939], 14) remove ויעצמו and וירבו as redactional additions.

⁶ See the discussions in Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 352-53; Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 25-36; Jacob, *Exodus*, 9.

in Egypt. The use of שרץ together with פרה and רבה is found only in the Priestly flood narrative Gen 8:17; 9:7, and ותמלא הארץ אתם corresponds to the imperative ומלאו in Gen 1:28. Exodus 1:7 likewise takes up the promise of El Shaddai to Abraham from Gen 17:2, 6 to multiply Abraham's descendants exceedingly (v. 2 והפרתי אתך במאד מאד v.6; וארבה אותך במאד מאד), pointing to Exod 1:7 as the fulfillment of these promises and going beyond the magnitude of these promises with the addition of שרץ ותמלא הארץ אתם.⁷ Exodus 1:7 is thus a necessary conclusion to the themes of the first part of the Priestly narrative arch which binds together the primeval and patriarchal narratives from Genesis with the history of the nation of Israel in Exodus in the Priestly narrative.⁸

Exodus 1:13-14 are the next Priestly texts, which describe the oppression of the Israelites in Egyptian slavery:⁹

1:13	ויעבדו מצרים את־בני ישראל בפרך
1:14	וימררו את־חיייהם בעבדה קשה [בחמר ובלבנים ובכל־עבדה בשדה] ¹⁰ את כל־עבדתם ¹¹ אשר־עבדו בהם בפרך

The Priestly account emphasizes the "harshness" (פרך) of the labor (עבדה) the Israelites were subjected to, intensifying the non-P account of v.11.¹² As noted by Dozeman, vv.13-14 go beyond the non-P account and highlight the legal background of the oppression of Israel in Egyptian slavery.¹³ The Egyptian oppression of Israel suppress-

⁷ Moshe Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus: A Holistic Commentary on Exodus 1-11* (2nd. ed.; Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2013), 29-30.

⁸ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 35-36; Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 30.

⁹ These verses are assigned universally to P (Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 37).

¹⁰ The phrase בחמר ובלבנים ובכל־עבדה בשדה is considered a later supplement by Schmidt (*Exodus*, 16) and Dillmann (*Exodus-Levitikus*, 13).

¹¹ Dillmann takes את כל־עבדתם as a secondary addition from RP (*Exodus-Levitikus*, 13).

¹² So according to Houtman, Exod 1:13-14 is a broadening and intensification of the labor described in the non-Priestly 1:11 (*Exodus II* [trans. Johan Rebel and Sierd Woudstra; HCOT; Kampen: Kok, 1993], 249). פרך is related to the Akkadian *paraku*, which stands for violent inhumane behavior and harsh treatment (Jacob, *Exodus*, 16).

¹³ The phrase anticipates the legal language of Lev 25:43, 46, 54, highlighting the illegal nature of the oppression from the perspective of the Holiness Code, and Exod 1:7 as the background of

es the creational blessings (1:7), and in the Holiness Code, harsh treatment (פרך) is described as illegal, which situates the Egyptian oppression in a legal background and makes Pharaoh's actions tyrannical.¹⁴ The concluding verses of Exod 2:23aβ-25 likewise develop key themes in the Priestly narrative, expanding the theme of the servitude (עבדה) from 1:13-14 to describe the psychological and social conditions of Israel's slavery:¹⁵

וַיֹּאנְחוּ בְנֵי־יִשְׂרָאֵל מִן־הָעֲבָדָה וַיִּזְעֻקוּ וַתַּעַל שְׁוַעֲתָם אֶל־הָאֱלֹהִים מִן־הָעֲבָדָה
וַיִּשְׁמַע אֱלֹהִים אֶת־נַאֲקָתָם וַיִּזְכֹּר אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּרִיתוֹ אֶת־אַבְרָהָם אֶת־יִצְחָק וְאֶת־יַעֲקֹב
וַיֹּרָא אֱלֹהִים אֶת־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וַיֹּדַע¹⁶ אֱלֹהִים

The notion of God remembering (ויזכר) his covenant (בריתו) with the patriarchs calls into view the Priestly patriarchal history in Genesis and links to the other Priestly texts of Gen 9:15-16; Exod 6:5, which associate God's remembering his covenant with the salvation of Israel.¹⁷ This text presents the patriarchal covenant as the main reason for God intervening on behalf of Israel to rescue them from slavery.¹⁸ It also points forward to the remembrance of the Exodus by Israel in the establishment of the Passover as a זכרון in response to YHWH's act of remembering Israel (12:12-14). Exodus 2:23aβ-25 is an important transition in the Priestly salvation history from slavery to liberation, pointing to the future acts of God in rescuing his people.¹⁹ Whereas in Exod 1:7 God's promise to multiply the descendants of the patriarchs is fulfilled (Gen

the oppression highlights the anti-creational nature of the oppression (Dozeman, *Exodus*, 57, 72).

¹⁴ Jacob, *Exodus*, 16. On this connection, see also Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 53-55.

¹⁵ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 92. The repetition of עבדה in 2:23aβ-25 connects the passage with 1:13-14 (Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 54). Against the proposals of Von Rad and Weimar, the repetitions within 2:23aβ-25 should not be used as criteria to divide the text into two strands of P, but reflects the typical style of P (Schmidt, *Exodus*, 90).

¹⁶ וַיֹּדַע *Qal* of the MT could be read with the LXX (ἐγνώσθη) as a *Nifal* וַיִּדָּע, also following Ezek 20:5 וַיִּדָּע לָהֶם בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם (against Blum, *Studien*, 240n43 and Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 64-65).

¹⁷ Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 106; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 57, 61; here also Lev 26:40-45 is noticeably similar.

¹⁸ Römer, "Von Moses Berufung zur Spaltung des Meers," 146.

¹⁹ Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 63.

17:2, 6; 28:3; 35:11; 48:4), the covenant in Exod 2:24 recalls the promise of land to the patriarchs (Gen 17:8; 28:4; 35:12; 48:4), which is yet to be fulfilled.²⁰ Though the Israelites live in the land of Goshen as an *אחזה* in which they are fruitful and multiply (Gen 47:27), the oppression of the Egyptians urgently raises the question of Israel needing its own land for the fulfillment of the promises.²¹

The Priestly texts Exod 1:7, 13-14; 2:23aβ-25 function in their context in Exod 1-2* to place the beginnings of Israel's Egyptian slavery into the coherent structure of the Priestly narrative by linking it to the creational blessings from Gen 1:26 (Exod 1:7 *פרה, רבה*), which characterizes the oppression by the Egyptians as "anti-creational." The Israelites have fulfilled the divine blessing to be fruitful and multiply, but they are in a foreign land and being oppressed by Egyptian slave-masters (1:13-14 *ויעבדו מצרים את-בני ישראל בפרך*). Israel responds by crying out, and their cry ascends to God, who remembers (*ויזכר*) his covenant with the patriarchs (2:23aβ-25).²²

5.2.2 Exodus 6:2–7:7*

Following Exod 2:23aβ-25, the Priestly narrative picks up in Exod 6:2–7:7*, with intervening non-Priestly materials in Exod 3:1-6:1. Exodus 6:2-8 is a unified and coherently structured divine speech that forms the center of Priestly theology as the revelation of the name of God as YHWH for Israel.²³

²⁰ Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 44; Konrad Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, (Siphrut 3; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010), 240.

²¹ Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18* [HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2015], 93-94, 100-101.

²² Dozeman, *Exodus*, 111.

²³ Against proposals by Otto ("Forschungen," 10n45), and others who remove the land theme from the Priestly narrative, there is no reason to remove vv.6-8 as secondary, since vv.2-8 are formed in a tight structural correspondence (cf. Anja Diesel, *"Ich bin Jahwe": Der Aufstieg der Ich-bin-Jahwe-Aussage zum Schlüsselwort des alttestamentlichen Monotheismus* [WMANT 110; Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2006], 95-118; L. Schmidt, *Priesterschrift*, 4; Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 15; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 244-250; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 241; Römer, "Von Moses Berufung," 140-42).

וידבר אלהים אל משה ויאמר אליו אני יהוה
וארא אל-אברהם אל-יצחק ואל-יעקב באל שדי ושמי יהוה לא נודעתי להם
וגם הקמתי את-בריתי אתם לתת להם את-ארץ כנען את ארץ מגריהם אשר-גרו בה
וגם אני שמעתי את-נאקת בני ישראל אשר מצרים מעבדים אתם ואזכר את-בריתי
לכן אמר לבני-ישראל אני יהוה והוצאתי אתכם מתחת סבלת מצרים
והצלתי אתכם מעבדתם וגאלתי אתכם בזרוע נטויה²⁴ ובשפטים גדלים
ולקחתי אתכם לי לעם והייתי לכם לאלהים וידעתם כי אני יהוה אלהיכם
המוציא אתכם מתחת סבלות מצרים
והבאתי אתכם אל-הארץ אשר נשאתי את-ידי לתת אתה לאברהם ליצחק וליעקב
ונתתי אתה לכם מורשה אני יהוה

The speech is part of a series of divine speeches that structure the Priestly history from creation, through the patriarchal narratives and beyond the Exodus, and continues the storyline from Exod 2:23aβ-25 (Gen 1:1–2:4a; 9:1-17; 17; 28; 35; 46; Exod 29:45-46).²⁵ It develops the theme of the gradual revelation of the divine name in the Priestly history from אלהים in the primeval history, to אל שדי in the patriarchal narratives, and finally to יהוה in the national history of Israel.²⁶ The structuring of the speech with the fourfold אני יהוה places the emphasis on the identity of YHWH as the God who is faithful to his promises to the patriarchs for the good of Israel.²⁷ Within the ancient Near Eastern context, self-revelation formulae like אני יהוה function in royal and divine speeches to establish the authority and power of the speaker, which are manifest in the actions of the speaker.²⁸ In Exod 6:2-8 it links to the covenant promise to give the land of Canaan to the Patriarchs (Gen 17:8a אחרִיךְ לך ולזרעך).

²⁴ Occasionally בִּזְרוּעַ נְטוּיָה is removed as secondary, proposing that it was added to connect Exod 6:2-8 to the pre-Priestly context of 6:1 (cf. Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 158; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 243).

²⁵ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 240-43. This integral connection between 2:23aβ-25 and 6:2-8 highlights the problematic assignment of 2:23aβ-25 to PT and Exod 6:2-8 to H by Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 60-61).

²⁶ Römer, "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document," 162-64; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 238-242.

²⁷ Diesel, *Ich bin Jahwe*, 108-109; Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 205.

²⁸ Diesel, *Ich bin Jahwe*, 184-85. According to Reinhard Müller, the phrase is a liturgical formula used to convey the rhetorical effect of the divine authority behind the laws ("The Sanctifying Divine Voice: Observations on the 'anî-Yhwh-formula in the Holiness Code," in *Text, Time, and Temple: Literary, Historical, and Ritual Studies in Leviticus* [eds. Francis Landy, Leigh M. Trevaskis, and Bryan Bibb; Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2015], 76-81).

as well as the promise to be the God of the descendants of Abraham (Gen 17:8b (והייתי להם לאלהים)), which YHWH promises to maintain (הקים).²⁹ The land is depicted as the heart of Israel's identity and relationship with YHWH. The speech affirms that YHWH has heard the cries of the Israelites in Egyptian slavery (שמעתי את-נאקת בני ישראל) and will remember his covenant (ואזכר (את-בריתי), thus continuing the Priestly narrative from Exod 2:23aβ-25. YHWH's remembrance of the covenant leads to him rescuing (והצילתי) and redeeming (וגאלתי) Israel out of slavery with an outstretched arm and great judgments (בזרוע נטויה ובשפטים). The use of גאל evokes a kinship relation between YHWH and Israel.³⁰ Salvation from Egypt results in Israel becoming the people of YHWH and YHWH being their God (ולקחתי אתכם לי לעם והייתי לכם לאלהים), as well as YHWH bringing Israel into the land promised to the patriarchs (והבאתי אתכם אל-הארץ). The links back to the Priestly patriarchal narratives in Genesis, and links forward to the key Priestly text in Exod 29:43-46 make Exod 6:2-8 an important pivot in the Priestly narrative.³¹

Following the divine speech in 6:2-8, there is widespread agreement that the subsequent narrative in Exod 6:9-12 contains the continuation of the Priestly narrative with Moses' response to the divine speech:³²

וידבר משה כן אל בני ישראל ולא שמעו אל משה מקצר רוח ומעבדה קשה
וידבר יהוה אל משה לאמר
בא דבר אל פרעה מלך מצרים וישלח את בני ישראל מארצו
וידבר משה לפני יהוה לאמר
הן בני ישראל לא שמעו אלי ואיך ישמעני פרעה ואני ערל שפתים

²⁹ On the translation of הקים as "maintain" or "fulfill," see Jacob, *Exodus*, 157.

³⁰ Ibid., 158.

³¹ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 77n167, 223-24.

³² Römer, "Von Moses Berufung zur Spaltung des Meers," 142; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 103.

Moses conveys the content of the divine speech to Israel, who do not listen due to their broken spirit and the hard labor imposed on them (מקצר רוח ומעבדה קשה). YHWH sends Moses to command Pharaoh to let Israel go, to which commission Moses objects: since not even the Israelites listened to him, why would Pharaoh listen? The resistance of the Israelites in 6:9-12 leads to Moses' authorization as the spokesman for YHWH in 7:1-7.³³ The concern of 7:1-7 is to affirm Moses' commission to Pharaoh following his rejection by the Israelites, and to establish an introductory framework for the ensuing plague narratives:

ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראה נתתיך אלהים לפרעה ואהרן אחיך יהיה נביאך
אתה תדבר את כל אשר אצוך ואהרן אחיך ידבר אל פרעה ושלח את בני ישראל מארצו
ואני אקשה את לב פרעה והרביתי את אתתי ואת מופתי בארץ מצרים
ולא ישמע אלכם פרעה ונתתי את ידי במצרים והוצאתי את צבאתי את עמי בני ישראל
מארץ מצרים בשפטים גדלים
וידעו מצרים כי אני יהוה בנטתי את ידי על מצרים והוצאתי את בני ישראל מתוכם
ויעש משה ואהרן כאשר צוה יהוה אתם כן עשו
ומשה בן שמנים שנה ואהרן בן שלש ושמנים שנה בדברם אל פרעה

Exodus 7:1-7 reaffirms Moses as the divinely authorized spokesman for YHWH.

Moses will be like "god" to Pharaoh (v.1 נתתיך אלהים לפרעה), whereas Aaron will be subordinated to Moses as a prophetic spokesman (ואהרן אחיך יהיה נביאך). Verses 2, 4-5 however present a different conception of the ensuing plagues compared with v.3. According to v.2, 4-5a, Moses and Aaron are to speak everything that YHWH commands them to Pharaoh, and when Pharaoh does not listen, YHWH will place his hand against Egypt (ונתתי את ידי במצרים) and bring Israel out of Egypt with great judgments (בשפטים גדלים). The "great judgments" develops the theme from Exod 6:6, and points to a violent blow by YHWH that is intended to result in the departure of the Israelites, which is picked up in the Priestly Passover account with the killing of

³³ Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 171; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 161. The genealogy of Exod 6:13-30 is a later insertion identified by the *Wiederaufnahme* in 6:13, 30, the purpose of which is to elevate the status of Aaron in relation to Moses (Otto, "Forschungen," 9n43; Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 155, 167).

the firstborn (Exod 12:12 ועברתי בארץ מצרים בלילה הזה והכיתי כל בכור בארץ מצרים).³⁴ The recognition statement according to which the Egyptians will know YHWH (וידעו מצרים כי אני יהוה) points to the destruction of Egypt in the Red Sea (Exod 14:4, 18).³⁵ Thus the conception of 7:2, 4-5a points to a fulfillment in Exod 12:12; 14:4, 18, and contains the notion that Moses and Aaron are to speak to Pharaoh. According to v.3, 5b YHWH will harden (אקשה) the heart of Pharaoh and increase signs and wonders in the land of Egypt (אתתי ואת מופתי) and stretch out his arm over Egypt and cause plagues (בנטתי את ידי על מצרים).³⁶ Verses 3, 5b thus introduce the conception of the Exodus as a result of signs and wonders, which encompasses a contest of five wonders between Aaron and the Egyptian magicians.³⁷ The five signs do not recount Moses and Aaron speaking to Pharaoh, but rather Aaron simply causes the wonders at the command of YHWH.³⁸ Thus v. 2, 4-5 and v.3, 5b present different conceptions of the subsequent events.³⁹ The contest between Aaron and the magicians in the series of five wonders has an independent character, which has led to suggestions by Reindl and Blum that it is a *Vorlage* utilized by P.⁴⁰ Following Berner and Kratz, the conception of the signs and wonders beginning with 7:3, 5b and containing the five wonder signs should be considered a secondary addition to the Priestly narrative. The Priestly

³⁴ Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 77; Schmidt, *Exodus*, 278, 316.

³⁵ Blum, *Studien*, 254; Houtman, *Exodus I*, 528.

³⁶ Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 162.

³⁷ These are the Serpent (7:8-13), Blood (7:19-20a, 21b-22), Frogs (8:1-3), Lice (8:12-15), and Boils (9:8-12).

³⁸ Houtman, *Exodus I*, 526; Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 147.

³⁹ Otto, "Forschungen," 9n43; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 252; Berner, "Der Literarische Charakter der Priesterschrift in der Exoduserzählung (Exod 1-14)," 103.

⁴⁰ Joseph Reindl, "Der Finger Gottes und die Macht der Götter: Ein Problem des ägyptischen Diasporajudentums und sein literarischer Niederschlag," in *Dienst der Vermittlung: Festschrift zum 25-jährigen Bestehen des Priesterseminars Erfurt* (eds. Wilhelm Ernst, Konrad Feiereis, and Fritz Hoffmann; ETS 37; Leipzig: St. Benno, 1977), 49-60; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 252.

narrative introduces the non-P plagues with 7:1-2, 4-5a, 6-7, after which it continues in Exod 12.⁴¹ The prefixing of 7:1-2, 4-5a, 6-7 to the non-Priestly plagues narratives places all of the plagues under the theological theme of the recognition of YHWH for the Israelites, which motif is taken up from the pre-Priestly account of the recognition of YHWH by the Egyptians.⁴² The purpose of the supplement of the wonder-contest initiated in 7:3, 5b is to establish the status of Aaron as superior to the Egyptian magicians and elevate his status in the cult.⁴³

5.2.3 Exodus 12

The great judgments (שפטים גדלים) and recognition of YHWH promised in Exod 6:2–7:7* point to the culmination of the Priestly narrative in Exod 12:12-14 and 14:4, 18, which emphasize the recognition of YHWH introduced in 6:2-8.⁴⁴ The Passover and Matzot connected with the Exodus and killing of the firstborn of the Egyptians in Exod 12-13* (with a pre-Priestly narrative connecting it to the exodus event from 11:4-8 through to 12:29-33) reflects multiple stages of development with back-and-forth interaction between Priestly and Deuteronomistic traditions.⁴⁵ The question of the purpose of the Priestly narrative and how it relates to literary criticism comes to a point in Exod 12-13: is the Priestly narrative considered a narrative source with no interest in ritual, and thus it only relates material that fits in the original his-

⁴¹ Berner, "Der Literarische Character der Priesterschrift in der Exoduserzählung (Exod 1-14)," 103, 107, 116. This is also argued by Kratz, *The Composition of the Historical Books of the Old Testament*, 243.

⁴² Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 246-47.

⁴³ Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 310.

⁴⁴ Against Ska and Lohfink, Exod 12* is intricately connected with Exod 6:2-8 and 7:1-7 and must be considered from the same layer (Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 88-93; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 77; Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 212).

⁴⁵ So according to Oswald and Utzschneider, "The P Composition counteracts the DtrH's complex system of festivals, dedications, and rituals that are all designed to actualize the exodus with an equally complex proposal in Exod 12:1-13, 18-20" (*Exodus 1-15*, 275). For a recent survey of interpretations, see Benjamin Kilchör, "Passah und Mazzot - Ein Überblick über die Forschung seit dem 19. Jahrhundert," *Biblica* 94 (2013): 340-67.

torical situation of the night of the Exodus, or is the Priestly narrative concerned with ritual and cultic issues that extend beyond the historical horizon of the text?⁴⁶ How scholars view the purpose of the Priestly narrative thus impacts how much ritual from Exod 12 is included in the base-narrative. The approach developed here will be based on an understanding of the Priestly narrative as an H-composition, as proposed for Gen 1:1–2:4a. The purpose of this narrative is to establish the foundations for the observance of the Passover legislated in the H festival calendar in Lev 23:5 (Exod 12:1-14*). Exodus 12:1-20*, 28, 40-51 are broadly considered as Priestly,⁴⁷ but within these texts it is possible to identify various stages of development, with multiple stages of development of H-materials as well. To anticipate the results of this analysis, the base layer of Priestly narrative is to be found in Exod 12:1-14*, 28, with 12:15-20, 43-51 comprising later supplements.

The starting point of analysis is Exodus 12:1-14 and its relationship to vv.21-27. Though some scholars argue for a unified understanding of 12:1-14,⁴⁸ most recognize that there is a distinction between material addressed in 3rd plural and material in 2nd plural address. The most common explanation for this distinction is that the difference results from the use of a *Vorlage*.⁴⁹ The impersonal 3rd plural address in

⁴⁶ See the discussion in Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 89-91. As noted by Clemens Leonhard, "Die literarkritische Analyse von Exod 12 ist darin Zirkelschlüssen ausgeliefert," ("Die Erzählung Exod 12 als Festlegende für das Pesachfest am Jerusalemer Tempel," *JBTh* 18 [2003]: 253).

⁴⁷ Mark S. Smith, "The Literary Arrangement of the Priestly Redaction of Exodus: A Preliminary Investigation," *CBQ* 58 (1996): 37; Childs, *Exodus*, 184; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 251. Knohl assigns the whole section to H, though in different layers (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 21).

⁴⁸ Van Seters takes all of 12:1-28 as a unified P composition (*The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers* [Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994], 114-19); Noth, *Exodus* (trans. J.S.Bowden; OTL; Philadelphia: Westminster, 1962), 92; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 262.

⁴⁹ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 199. According to Peter Laaf, the *Vorlage* is incorporated by P^G in vv.1, 3aα, 12, 13, and later supplemented with vv.2, 3aβ, bβ, 4, 5, 6a, 6b*, 9, 10, 11a, ba, 14 (*Die Pascha-Feier Israels* [BBB 36; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1970], 10-18). Kohata sees in vv. 4, 7b, 8b extensions of a Passover ritual connected with 1, 3a, 9-13 to P^G, and supplemented secondarily with vv. 2, 3aβ, 5, 6a, 14 (*Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 262-67). For Köckert, vv.1, 3a, 4, 9-11a, ba, 12-14a are extensions by P^G, and vv. 2, 3aβ, 5-6a, 8b, 14aβ, b are P^S supplements. Gertz sees a baseform in vv.1, 3aαb-5, 6b-8a, b*, 9-13, 28 which take up an ancient Passover regulation in vv.3b*, 6b*, 7a, 8a, 11bβ, with supplements in vv.2, 3aβ, 6a, 8b* (*Tradition und Redaktion*, 31-37). According to Otto, the base

12:3a, 6b, 7a, 8a, 11b β can be isolated into a series of *ve-qatal x* instructions as a ritual prescription:⁵⁰

12:3b	ויקחו להם איש שה לבית אבת
12:6b	ושחטו אתו...בין הערבים
12:7a	ולקחו מן הדם
	ונתנו על שתי המזוזות ועל המשקוף
12:8a	ואכלו את הבשר בלילה הזה
12:11b β	פסח הוא ליהוה

It is also agreed that Exod 12:1, 3a, 11-13 integrates this ritual into the Priestly Exodus narrative by making it a speech of YHWH (vv.1, 3a) and placing it in the context of the Exodus departure and killing of the Egyptian firstborn (vv.11-13).⁵¹ Beyond this however there are no clear criteria by which the base Priestly narrative that links to the Exodus history can be identified, leading to widely divergent proposals. I will argue for a fundamental unity of the Priestly material in Exod 12:1-14 that integrates the 3rd-plural ritual *Vorlage* into the Exodus event. The starting point to analyze this question is the relationship between the non-P Exod 12:21-27, and the Priestly 12:1-14*. Following the analysis of the relationship between these texts, I will consider two connected points that are debated regarding the internal unity of 12:1-14*. First, does v.14 relate to the preceding Passover instructions or the following Matzot instructions, and is it part of the original Priestly narrative? Second, what is the place of the dates for the Passover established in v.2, v.3ab, and v.6a?

In order to determine the internal constitution of Exod 12:1-14, it must be considered in relationship to 12:21-27 as well as to the pre-Priestly 12:29-33. There is no

form of P has preserved in 12:3b*, 6b*, 7a, 8a, 11b β an old pre-Deuteronomic ritual in 3rd plural address, distinguishable from the later 2nd plural additions, with 7b and 8b as later additions. This ancient Passover rite was taken up by a Priestly redaction in 12:1-14* (פסח *pāsaḥ*, *ThWAT* 6:9, 17-18). Von Rad argues that his PA is found in Exod 12:1, 2, 4b β , 5, 6a, 9-11, 13ff, and PB in 12:3, 4ab α , 6b, 7-8, 12 (*Priesterschrift*, 48).

⁵⁰ Laaf, *Pascha-Feier*, 15; Otto, פסח *pāsaḥ*, 9-10.

⁵¹ Weimar, "Exod 12:1-14 und die priesterschriftliche Geschichtsdarstellung," *ZAW* 107 (1995): 198.

agreement as to the unity of Exod 12:21-27, or whether it is pre-P or post-P.⁵² Though most scholars consider vv.21-27 to be a pre-Priestly account of the Passover, recently it has been argued that they are post-Priestly.⁵³ In the present form these verses constitute an execution report to the divine instructions of 12:1-14*, concluded with the Priestly execution formula in 12:28. Verses 1-14 and 21-27 have extensive correspondences, strongly suggesting that they are related.⁵⁴ These correspondences are found in vv.21-23, which mirror the central ritual actions from 1-14*, but the correspondence is noticeably only with the 3rd plural *Vorlage* in vv.1-10. Likewise the statements in vv.11-14 are paralleled in vv.23-27 in the sections that provide the interpretive framework for the Passover event:

Instructions for Passover by YHWH:	Mediation of Instructions by Moses:
3b ויקחו להם איש שה לבית אבת שה לבית	21b משכו וקח לכם צאן למשפחתכם
6b ושחטו אתו כל קהל עדת ישראל בין הערבים	21bβ ושחטו הפסח
7 ולקחו	22 ולקחתם אגדת אזוב וטבלתם בדם אשר בסף הגעתם
מן הדם ונתנו על שתי המזוזות ועל המשקוף	אל המשקוף ואל שתי המזוזות מן הדם אשר בסף
על הבתים אשר יאכלו אתו בהם	ואתם לא תצאו איש מפתח ביתו עד בקר

⁵² See the discussion in Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 271. According to Laaf, Exod 12:21-23 is the oldest (J) ritual, to which vv.24-27 was added as a D supplement (*Pascha-Feier*, 21). Rainer Schmitt summarizes that Exod 11:1-8; 12:21-23, 27b, 29-39 form the oldest, pre-Deuteronomy form of the Passover (*Exodus und Passa: Ihr Zusammenhang im Alten Testament* [2nd ed.; OBO 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1982], 21). J. Schreiner contends that JE added the Passover (Exod 12:21-23) and Matzot (12:39) to the Exodus tradition ("Exodus 12:21-23 und das israelitische Pascha," in *Studien zum Pentateuch: Festschrift für W. Kornfeld* [ed. G. Braulik; Vienna: Herder, 1977], 86). According to Baentsch, vv.21-23 are an older tradition taken up by J (*Exodus*, 100).

⁵³ Though it is also argued that vv.21-27 are an isolated fragment of post-Priestly origins as a development of 12:1-14* which is now presented as an execution report to the Priestly instructions, there are problems with this position, as it can also be seen as part of the non-P composition from 11:4-8 and 12:29-33. As shown by Oswald and Utzschneider, 12:21-27 can be read coherently as a Deuteronomic supplement to the non-P narrative tradition between 11:4-8 and 12:29-33 (*Exodus 1-15*, 273). Verses 21, 27 are brackets that integrate the section into the pre-P narrative (Otto, פסח *pāsaḥ*, 10). According to the thesis of Gesundheit, Exod 12:21-27 is the post-P continuation of vv.1-11, whereas vv.21-27 have influenced a later Priestly addition in vv.12-13 in the opposite direction (*Three Times a Year: Studies on Festival Legislation in the Pentateuch* [FAT 82; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012], 68-72). Most scholars however consider at least parts of vv.12-14 as part of the original Priestly narrative which is required to incorporate the Passover ritual into the Exodus event. As will be discussed below, vv.12-14 feature crucial content for the Priestly narrative that link it to the Priestly texts in Exod 2:24-25; 6:2-7:7*.

⁵⁴ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 56, 61-71, 82; Kilchör, *Mosetora und Jahwetora: Das Verhältnis von Deuteronomium 12-26 zu Exodus, Levitikus und Numeri* [BZAR 21; Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015], 171-72.

11b	ואכלתם אתו בחפזון פסח הוא ליהוה	27	ואמרתם זבח־פסח הוא ליהוה אשר פסח על־בתי בני־ישראל במצרים בנגפו את־מצרים ואת־בתינו הציל ועבר יהוה לנגף את מצרים
12	ועברתי בארץ מצרים בלילה הזה והכיתי כל בכור בארץ מצרים מאדם ועד בהמה ובכל אלהי מצרים אעשה שפטים אני יהוה	23aa	
13	והיה הדם לכם לאת על הבתים אשר אתם שם וראייתי את הדם ופסחתי עלכם ולא יהיה בכם נגף למשחית בהכתי בארץ מצרים	23ab	וראה את הדם על המשקוף ועל שתי המזוזות ופסח יהוה על הפתח ולא יתן המשחית לבא אל בתיכם לנגף
14	והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון וחגתם אתו חג ליהוה לדורתיכם חקת עולם תחגוהו	24	ושמרתם את הדבר הזה לחק לך ולבניך עד עולם

The ritual features shared between vv.3b, 6b-7 and vv.21-23 are those found in the 3rd plural *Vorlage* proposed in Exod 12:1-14*. Determining the relationship between the ritual actions in vv.3, 6-7 and vv.21-23 however is difficult. The clearest starting place for determining the relationship between these texts is in the interpretive section vv.11-14 and vv.21-27, where it can be established that vv.11-14 are an interpretation of vv.21-27 that also integrates the pre-Priestly narrative from 12:29-33.

Gesundheit, who argues that vv.21-23 are a post-Priestly supplement to vv.1-11*, nevertheless contends that vv.21-27 have influenced the Priestly texts in vv.11*-14. Verses 11-14 however are crucial for linking the Priestly Passover account in 12:1-14* to the larger Priestly Exodus narrative and cannot be separated from it, and thus it is inconsistent to argue that vv.23-27 are prior to vv.11-14, but are also a revision of vv.1-11. Gesundheit and others before him have nevertheless argued that vv.23-27 have influenced vv.11-14, where a consistent redactional tendency to modify vv.23-27 in light of the concerns of the Priestly narrative and theology can be identified.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ For a similar analysis and assessment, see Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 243-46.

11b	ואכלתם אתו בחפזון פסח הוא ליהוה	27	ואמרתם זבח־פסח הוא ליהוה אשר פסח על־בתי בני־ישראל במצרים בנגפו את־מצרים ואת־בתינו הציל
12	ועברתי בארץ מצרים בלילה הזה והכיתי כל בכור בארץ מצרים מאדם ועד בהמה ובכל אלהי מצרים אעשה שפטים אני יהוה	23αα	ועבר יהוה לנגף את מצרים
13	והיה הדם לכם לאת על הבתים אשר אתם שם וראיתי את הדם ופסחתי עלכם ולא יהיה בכם נגף למשחית בהכתי בארץ מצרים	23aβb	וראה את הדם על המשקוף ועל שתי המזוזות ופסח יהוה על הפתח ולא יתן המשחית לבא אל בתיכם לנגף
14	והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון וחתגם אתו חג ליהוה לדורותיכם חקת עולם תחגוהו	24	ושמרתם את הדבר הזה לחק לך ולבניך עד עולם

The integration of v.29 conflated with v.23 into vv.12-13⁵⁶ is strong evidence that vv.12-13 is a revision of v.23 and 29, as seen in this parallel of vv.12-13, 23, and 29:

vv.12-13	vv.29-30	v.23
ועברתי בארץ מצרים בלילה הזה והכיתי כל בכור בארץ מצרים מאדם ועד בהמה ובכל אלהי מצרים אעשה שפטים אני יהוה והיה הדם לכם לאת על הבתים אשר אתם שם וראיתי את־הדם ופסחתי עלכם ולא יהיה בכם נגף למשחית בהכתי בארץ מצרים	ויהי בחצי הלילה ויהוה הכה כל־בכור בארץ מבכר פרעה הישב על־כסאו עד בכור השבי אשר בבית הבור וכל בכור בהמה ...כִּי־אין בית אשר אין שם מת	ועבר יהוה לנגף את מצרים וראה את־הדם על־המשקוף ועל שתי המזוזות ופסח יהוה על־הפתח ולא יתן המשחית לבא אל־בתיכם לנגף

This parallel shows that vv.12-13 has **conflated** the smiting (נכה) of the firstborn in the night (כל־בכור) from the pre-Priestly narrative in vv.29-33 with the perspective of YHWH passing through to strike (נגף) Egypt from v.23 (ועבר יהוה לנגף את מצרים) and the blood protection rite. Such conflation points to the direction of dependence from vv.29-33 and vv.21-23 to vv.11-14.⁵⁷ There is no consistent tendency as to why

⁵⁶ Jacob (*Exodus*, 311) and Dillmann note the influence of v.29 on 12:12 (*Exodus-Leviticus*, 118), and Holzinger the influence of v.23 on 12:12-13 (*Exodus* [Tübingen: Mohr, 1900], 38).

⁵⁷ On the use of conflation as a criteria for determining direction of dependence, see Carr, "Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34:11-26 and Its Parallels," in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Exod 32-34 und Dtn 9-10* (eds. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum; VWGT 18; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001), 126, and Kilchör, *Mosetora und Jahwetora*, 39-41. According to Carr, a text tends to be later than its „parallel“ when it: 1) Verbally parallels that text and yet includes substantial pluses vis-à-vis that text; 2) Appears to enrich its parallel (fairly fully preserved); 3) Includes a plus that fills what could have been perceived as an apparent gap in its parallel; 4) Includes expansive material in character speeches,

vv.21-23 would have modified vv.11-14, and on the other hand it can be shown how the Priestly account refashions vv.23-27 from the perspective of the Priestly narrative:⁵⁸

1. According to v.23, YHWH passes through Egypt, preventing *המשחית* from entering the houses to strike. Verse 23 itself reflects two conceptions of the destruction, indicating that the verse has integrated an older tradition.⁵⁹ On the one hand, YHWH will pass through the land to strike in vv.23a, 27 (*ועבר יהוה לנגף את מצרים*), whereas in v.23b YHWH prevents the destroyer from striking (*ולא יתן המשחית לבא אל*), preceded by a redundant *ופסח יהוה* which suggests there is a concern to emphasize the action of YHWH over against the *משחית*.⁶⁰ Thus vv.23, 27 reflect an integration of an older tradition of a destroyer, which integration is carried further in the Priestly account in vv.11-14. Against proposals that *המשחית* is a post-Priestly supplement in v.23,⁶¹ the emphasis on the action of YHWH with first-person verbs (*אני יהוה* in vv.11-14, including the emphatic *אני יהוה*), stresses the fact that YHWH is the one who acts, and no other.⁶² The phrase *לא יהיה*

particularly theophanic speech; 5) Has an element which appears to be an adaptation of an element in the other text to shifting circumstances/ideas; 6) Combines linguistic phenomena from disparate strata of the Pentateuch ("Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence," 126). Exodus 12:12-13 satisfies all of these criteria in relation to vv.23, 29-33.

⁵⁸ Cf. Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 68-73. Though Berner argues for an opposite direction of dependence, those arguments do not show the consistent coherency of intentional redaction as is seen in the opposite direction of dependence (*Exoduserzählung*, 286).

⁵⁹ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 68; Otto, *פסח pāsah*, 9ff; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 49. Some argue for the destroyer motif as a late, post-P addition, see the discussion in Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 49-50.

⁶⁰ Otto, *פסח pāsah*, 12; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 49-50; Leonhard, "Die Erzählung Exod 12 als Festlegende für das Pesachfest am Jerusalemer Tempel," 250. Weimar argues that the earliest layer of vv.1-14* depends on vv.21-23, and suggests that the main concern here is to accentuate the actions of YHWH ("Zum Problem der Entstehungsgeschichte von Exod 12:1-14," *ZAW* 107 [1995]: 15n58).

⁶¹ Cf. Albertz, who argues for a post-P origins of vv.21-27, nevertheless proposes that the *משחית* in v.23 reflects an ancient tradition (*Exodus 1-18*, 211).

⁶² Cf. also the unusual syntax in v.27 which suggests that the *משחית* may have been removed from that verse (Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 68n51), and the discussion by Otto on the unusual

נגף למשחית in 12:13 is superfluous to the context of YHWH passing through the land in striking (נכה) Egypt as described in 12:12-13, which suggests that נגף למשחית has been introduced to modify the concept of בתיכם לנגף from v.23.

2. The account in vv.21-27 reflects the notion that YHWH's destruction is not specified to the firstborn, but that YHWH would strike all of Egypt, and hence it contains the prohibition against Israelites going outside their houses (v.22), supported by the statement in v.27 that YHWH saved the whole houses of the Israelites.⁶³ The non-Priestly account in vv.21-27 has thus combined two traditions of the killing of the firstborn and the historicizing of the Passover rite with the striking of the Egyptians.⁶⁴ The Priestly account specifies the destruction to the firstborn (והכיתי כל בכור בארץ) (מצרים), suggesting that the Priestly account took up the concept of a נגף coming on all those who are not protected within houses from vv.21-27 and integrated it with the striking (נכה) of the firstborn from the pre-Priestly narrative in vv.29-33. It is difficult to explain the alternative direction of dependence according to which vv.21-27 would have extended an original attack against firstborn only to anyone who goes outside the house.

3. Verses 27 and 11 indicate different conceptions of פסח היהוה:

11b	ואכלתם אתו בחפזון פסח הוא ליהוה	27	ואמרתם זבח-פסח הוא ליהוה אשר פסח עלי-בתי בני-ישראל במצרים בנגפו את-מצרים ואת-בתינו הציל
-----	---------------------------------	----	---

Verse 27 reflects the apotropaic notion of the Passover seen in vv.21-27, where YHWH "passed over" the houses of Israel and spared them from destruction. The Priestly account modifies this etymology of פסח by associating it with "eating with

syntax of v.23 (Otto, פסח *pāsaḥ*, 12).

⁶³ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 71-72; Loewenstamm, *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition* (Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992), 191.

⁶⁴ Laaf, *Pascha-Feier*, 23.

haste" (בחפזון) and omits the notion of the Passover as a זבח, avoiding the notion of the Passover as an extra-temple sacrifice in which laity participate in priest-like activities.⁶⁵ The Priestly account deviates from the ritual requirements of a sacrificial meal centered at the temple, but nevertheless involves aspects of a sacrifice without the presence of a tabernacle or priesthood.⁶⁶ The blood rite in vv.21-27 is understood as an apotropaic rite which prevents the destruction of the Israelites. The Priestly account in vv.11-14 takes up this understanding, but prefixes it with והיה הדם לכם לאת, which de-emphasizes the aspect of power in the blood to thwart the destruction, and makes the blood a sign of cognition.⁶⁷ The blood is placed (נתן) on the houses (v.7, 13),⁶⁸ with no attention to details for smearing it on the doorposts and lintel.⁶⁹ Understanding the blood as a sign (אות) for the Israelites places the Passover in the tradition of the Priestly signs of the rainbow and circumcision (Gen 9:11-16; 17:9-14), each of which reflect a process of "de-mythologization" that is carried out with the blood of the Passover in Exod 12:13.⁷⁰ The use of אות, ראה, and שחת also link the Passover to the Priestly flood account (Gen 9:11-16), with the establishment of the rainbow as a

⁶⁵ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 72-73. According to Jeon, vv.21-27 approves of a situation with lay people participating in a Passover sacrifice that includes priest-like activity, which is "exactly the situation that the Priestly Passover law (12:1-14) is attempting to avoid; although P uses the term שחט (v.6), the detailed description of this activity (vv.8-9) is clearly differentiated from the temple sacrifice performed by priests" (*The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story*, 164). In contrast to Jeon, rather than proposing that the redactor of vv.21-27 intended to reject the notion of the Priestly account by introducing the Passover as a sacrifice and extending participation to laity, it can be argued that since vv.21-27 describe "exactly the situation that the Priestly Passover law (12:1-14) is attempting to avoid," the Priestly account in vv.1-14 would have intentionally avoided this situation by modifying vv.21-27 in line with its interests.

⁶⁶ William Gilders, "Sacrifice before Sinai and the Priestly Narratives," in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions* (eds. Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden; AThANT 95; Zürich: TVZ, 2009), 60-62.

⁶⁷ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 68-69.

⁶⁸ This suggests that על שתי המזוזות ועל המשקוף in v.7 is a secondary addition to align the text with v.23.

⁶⁹ The doorposts and lintel are replaced by "you" (בכם, עלכם).

⁷⁰ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 69; Fox, "Sign of the Covenant," 575; Loewenstamm, *Evolution of the Exodus Tradition*, 202-203. On the rainbow, see Arnold, "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative (Genesis 6:9-9:29)," 31-35.

sign that preserves Israel from destruction. As noted by Köckert, verses 12-14 reflect the themes from the Priestly account of circumcision in Gen 17:9-13, as well as the rainbow in Gen 9:12-15:⁷¹

Gen 17:9-13	Gen 9:12-15	Exod 12:13-14
9 ואתה את־בריתי תשמר אתה וזרעך אחר־ך לִדְרֹתָם	12 זאת אֹת־הַבְּרִית... לִדְרֹת עוֹלָם	13 והיה הדם לכם לֶאֱמָנָה... וְרָאִיתִי אֶת־הַדָּם
11 ונמלתם את בשר ערלתכם והיה לֶאֱמָנָה בְּרִית בֵּינִי וּבֵינֵיכֶם	15 והיתה הקשת בענן וְרָאִיתִיהָ לְזִכָּר בְּרִית עוֹלָם	14 והיה היום הזה לכם לְזִכָּרוֹן וְחָגַתֶּם אֹתוֹ חֹג לַיהוָה
12 ובן־שְׁמֹנֶת יָמִים יִמּוֹל לָכֶם כָּל־זָכָר לִדְרֹתֵיכֶם		לִדְרֹתֵיכֶם חֻקַּת עוֹלָם
13 ברית בבשרכם לברית עוֹלָם		

This affinity points to a concern for the Priestly authors to establish these signs (אֹתֹת) as eternal ordinances (לִדְרֹתֵיכֶם עוֹלָם).⁷² The passover as a זִכָּרוֹן (v.14) is an important counterpart to YHWH's remembrance (זָכַר) of Israel in bondage and saving them because of the covenant (בְּרִית) with Abraham (2:23-25).⁷³ The act of remembrance expresses the hope that YHWH will be true to his promises and covenant. It also corresponds to the Priestly narratives leading up to the Exodus, with YHWH executing judgments (בְּכָל אֱלֹהֵי מִצְרַיִם אֲעֲשֶׂה שְׁפָטִים אֲנִי יְהוָה) (v.12) against the gods of the Egyptians as a culmination of his self-revelation in Exod 6:2–7:7*.⁷⁴ It is often argued that v.14 belongs with the later addition for the Unleavened Bread in vv.15-17, due to description of the Passover as a חֹג and the conclusion that is similar to v.17 with לִדְרֹתֵיכֶם חֻקַּת עוֹלָם as a bracketing phrase for inserting vv.14-17.⁷⁵ However, "this day" most naturally refers back to the day on which Israel will perform the Passover in vv.6, 13.⁷⁶ From the perspective of the instructions in vv.1-13 this relates to the future

⁷¹ Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 89.

⁷² Cf. Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 121, 125, 140, who assigns 12:14 to P^G.

⁷³ Schmitt, *Exodus und Passa*, 83-85.

⁷⁴ Diesel, *Ich Bin Jahwe*, 202; Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 295.

⁷⁵ Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 323; Gertz, *Tradition*, 23; Laaf, *Pascha-Feier*, 16; Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 208-209.

⁷⁶ Schmitt, *Exodus und Passa*, 80n253. This is noted by Gesundheit, who nevertheless goes on to argue that v.14 belongs with what follows in vv.15-17. The meaning in this context is fittingly

celebration of the day of the Passover as "this [Passover] day,"⁷⁷ as suggested also by the literary form of v.14 created in parallel to v.13, as well as from the chiasmic structure of v.14b, which often indicates closure of a topical unit in Priestly style.⁷⁸

12:13 והיה הדם לכם לאת
12:14 והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון

Some scholars maintain v.14a *והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון* as part of the base narrative of vv.1-14a, which establishes the passover as a "remembrance" (*לזכרון*) that implies an interest in future observance of the day for the base layer of the Priestly narrative, but remove the second part of the verse, which specifies the *זכרון* as a *חג*.⁷⁹ There are no compelling reasons however to divide the verse.⁸⁰ The *זכרון* requires the further explanation of what this remembrance consists of with *חג ליהוה*. Gesundheit overlooks the parallel between v.14 and v. 24 in his analysis, though he nevertheless presumes that 12:24-25 has been revised in 12:14.⁸¹

והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון וחגתם אתו חג ליהוה 14 לדורותיכם חקת עולם תחגוהו	24	ושמרתם את הדבר הזה לחק לך ולבניך עד עולם
---	----	---

Since it is shown that vv.23-27 influence vv.11-13, there is no reason to presume also that v.24 would not have influenced v.14.⁸² There are no compelling grammatical reasons to deny what Gesundheit calls a "natural inclination" to read v.14 as the conclusion to the preceding Passover account, with *זה* referring to something preceding and

ambiguous, as it refers both to the day of the departure, as well as the Passover evening, and also functions as the day for future "actualizing" of the Passover (John Durham, *Exodus* [WBC 3; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987], 157-58).

⁷⁷ Houtman, *Exodus II*, 185; cf. Childs, *Exodus*, 196-97.

⁷⁸ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 76-77.

⁷⁹ Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 74, 82; Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 89, 93. Others such as Schmitt, *Exodus und Passa*, 80; Beer and Galling, *Exodus*, 60-61; Holzinger, *Exodus*, 34, 38; Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 121, and Noth, *Exodus*, 92, take v.14 as a whole as part of P^G.

⁸⁰ Weimar, "Zum Problem," 11.

⁸¹ Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 82-83.

⁸² Berner assigns v.24 to the same layer as v.14 and does not discuss their relationship (*Exoduszählung*, 327-28, 40). Even if it were argued that v.24 depends on v.14, this would mean that 12:1-14 were combined before the addition of 12:15-20, and hence v.14 would not belong with the following vv.15-17, since it is universally agreed that 12:15-20 are later than 12:21-27.

already known, and allow that the introduction of the blood as an **אֹת** would include a statement regarding its significance for future generations as with the signs in Gen 9:11-16 and 17:9-14. The "ambiguity" that has led many scholars to assign the verse with what follows in vv.15-17 results from the imitation of v.14 in v.17 when vv.15-17 were added to incorporate the Feast of Unleavened Bread into the **הַיּוֹם הַזֶּה** of the Passover remembrance in v.14. The objection that v.14 cannot belong with the preceding Passover instructions because the Passover is not called a **חַג** anywhere else begs the question,⁸³ and can be explained by considering Exod 12:1-14 as intended from the start to provide the instructions for observing the Passover **חַג** as part of the festival calendar of Lev 23. The connections of 12:12-14 with the key Priestly terms **זָכַר**, **שָׁפַטִים**, and **אֲנִי יְהוָה** from Exod 2:23-25; 6:2-7:7* suggest that vv.12-14 as a whole can be preserved in the Priestly narrative, unless it is presumed from the start that the narrators would not have been interested in legislating for future observance of the Passover. Since the non-P account in v.24 contains instructions to memorialize the Passover as a "statute for you and your sons forever" (**לְחַק לְךָ וּלְבְנֶיךָ עַד עוֹלָם**), to be observed and remembered once Israel enters the land (vv.25-27), it is fair to say that the Priestly account would include its version of this orientation towards future observance in v.14: **חַג לִיהוָה לְדֹרֹתֵיכֶם חֻקַּת עוֹלָם תַּחֲגֹהוּ**.⁸⁴

At this point we can summarize the following: The differences between vv.23-27 and vv.11-14 reflect a redactional process in which vv.11-14 have modified

⁸³ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 297. Berner's suggestion that v.14 depends on the instructions for Unleavened Bread in 13:3 can be reversed and argued for a direction of dependence in the opposite direction, especially since other features of 13:3-16 can be explained as interpretations of 12:1-14, 21-27 (*Exoduszählung*, 323.).

⁸⁴ Kilchör, *Mosetora und Jahwetora*, 173; cf. also Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 74-78 on the influence of 12:21-23 on vv.1-14*, which leads to including v.14* in the base Priestly layer (though he removes the second half of the verse without justification).

the concepts from vv.23-27 with tendencies consistent with the concerns of the Priestly narrative and conflated them with the pre-Priestly narrative in vv.29-33. To argue for the opposite direction of dependence one would have to explain why vv.21-27 extended the threat of destruction beyond the firstborn to everyone in Egypt, why the blood ritual is made more apotropaic over against vv.1-14, which reflects an understanding of the apotropaic ritual but with a concern to modify it into a sign, and why the concept of a personal destroyer would have been introduced, leading to textual unevenness in vv.23-27.⁸⁵ It can thus be established that vv.21-27, 29-33 have influenced vv.11-14, which verses in turn are integral to the Priestly narrative and its conception of the Passover. Thus the Priestly account in vv.1-14 is a redactional composition that integrates vv.21-27, 29-33. Two conclusions can be drawn from this which relate to the overall interpretation of Exodus 12-13: 1) Exodus 12:21-27 has influenced the Priestly ritual instructions in vv.1-11, though this question would be difficult to establish with clear criteria from a comparison of these ritual verses apart from vv.12-14.⁸⁶ 2) Given the fact that the pre-Priestly account in 12:21-27 contains a concern for establishing the Passover remembrance for future generations, the Priestly account in vv.1-14 would also have a concern for establishing its own system of festivals, dedications, and rituals for the observance of the Passover for future generations.⁸⁷

⁸⁵ Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 49-50.

⁸⁶ The objections that speak against vv.21-27 preceding vv.1-13 are the use of the definite article with *הַפֶּסַח* in v.22, and the introduction of instructions by Moses to the elders without a preceding divine speech (Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 286-89). Berner also notes that vv.21-23 require vv.1-13 to announce the threat of the killing, since he excludes 11:4-8 from the pre-Priestly texts, and that the blood ritual in vv.21-23 is described in details that fill out missing elements from vv.1-13. As noted by Gertz however, the definite *הַפֶּסַח* is not necessarily a back-reference to vv.1-13, since the definite article can also express uniqueness as indicated by the context, such as *הַסֵּנֶה* in Exod 3:2 (*Tradition und Redaktion*, 50). According to Gesenius, in this use the article denotes "a single person or thing (primarily as one which is as yet unknown, and therefore not capable of being defined) as being present to the mind under given circumstances" (*Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar* [ed. E. Kautsch; trans. A.E. Cowley; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910], 126q-r). Oswald and Utzschneider and others have argued that 11:4-8 are pre-Priestly, and that the constellation of Moses speaking the word of God to the elders is typical of Deuteronomistic texts (*Exodus 1-15*, 273).

⁸⁷ Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 275. Though there may be internal growth within

What then is the explanation for the similarities between vv.21-23 and vv.1-11,

which are seen in the following chart?

3b	ויקחו להם איש שה לבית אבת שה לבית	21b	משכו וקח לכם צאן למשפחתיכם
6b	ושחטו אתו כל קהל עדת ישראל בין הערבים	21bβ	ושחטו הפסח
7	ולקחו	22	ולקחתם אגדת אוזב וטבלתם בדם אשר בסף הגעתם
	מן הדם ונתנו על שתי המזוזות ועל המשקוף		אל המשקוף ואל שתי המזוזות מן הדם אשר בסף
	על הבתים אשר יאכלו אתו בהם		ואתם לא תצאו איש מפתח ביתו עד בקר
11b	ואכלתם אתו בחפזון פסח הוא ליהוה	27	ואמרתם זבח־פסח הוא ליהוה
			אשר פסח על־בתי בני־ישראל במצרים
			בנגפו את־מצרים ואת־בתינו הציל

This chart indicates that the parallels between vv.3-11* and vv.21-27 correspond with proposals for the reconstructed 3rd plural *Vorlage* in vv.1-11:

Reconstructed <i>Vorlage</i> :	Instructions of Moses in vv.21-27:
12:3b	ויקחו להם איש שה לבית אבת
12:6b	ושחטו אתו...בין הערבים
12:7a	ולקחו
	מן הדם ונתנו על שתי המזוזות ועל המשקוף
12:8a	ואכלו את הבשר בלילה הזה
12:11bβ	פסח הוא ליהוה
	21b משכו וקח לכם צאן למשפחתיכם
	21bβ ושחטו הפסח
	22 ולקחתם אגדת אוזב וטבלתם בדם אשר בסף הגעתם
	אל המשקוף ואל שתי המזוזות מן הדם אשר בסף
	ואתם לא תצאו איש מפתח ביתו עד בקר
	27 ואמרתם זבח־פסח הוא ליהוה
	אשר פסח על־בתי בני־ישראל במצרים
	בנגפו את־מצרים ואת־בתינו הציל

Rather than postulating an independent 3rd plural *Vorlage* that the Priestly narrative would have incorporated into vv.1-11, these parallels suggest that the Priestly ritual in vv.1-11 has been constructed on the basis of the instructions in vv.21-27.⁸⁸

vv.21-27, it can nevertheless be considered as a whole to precede the Priestly account. There are no literary breaks between the ritual instructions in 12:21-23 and the parenthesis in vv.24-27, and hence the section vv.21-27 should be taken as a unified whole which can be considered in some sense Deuteronomistic material (Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 200-201; Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 270-73; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 38-39).

⁸⁸ This is hinted at by Dillmann (*Exodus-Leviticus*, 125), following Gottlieb Klein, "Die Totaphot nach Bibel und Tradition," *JPTTh VII* (1881): 667, who argues that the author of 12:1-10 had vv.21-24 before him when composing his work. According to Kohata, the pre-Priestly text in vv.21-23 and the *Vorlage* in vv.1-14 belong to the same tradition (*Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 271).

Instructions utilized from vv.21-27:

Priestly Interpretation:

12:21a	וקחו לכם	12:3b-6a	בעשר לחדש הזה ויקחו להם איש שה לבית־אבת שה לבית ואם־ימעט הבית מהית משה ולקח הוא ושכנו הקרב אל ביתו במכסת נפשת איש לפי אכלו תכסו על־השה שה תמים זכר בן־שנה יהיה לכם מן־הכבשים ומן־העזים תקחו והיה לכם למשמרת עד ארבעה עשר יום לחדש הזה
12:21b	ושחטו	12:6b	ושחטו אתו כל קהל עדת ישראל בין הערבים
12:22	ולקחתם...מן־הדם	12:7-10	ולקחו מן־הדם ונתנו [על־שתי המזוזות ועל־המשקוף] על הבתים אשר־יאכלו אתו בהם ואכלו את־הבשר בלילה הזה צל־אש [ומצות] על־מררים יאכלהו אל־תאכלו ממנו נא ובשל מבשל במים כי אם־צל־אש ראשו על־כרעיו ועל־קרבו ולא־תותירו ממנו עד־בקר והנותר ממנו עד־בקר באש תשרפו
12:27	פסח הוא ליהוה	12:11	וככה תאכלו אתו מתניכם חגרים נעליכם ברגליכם ומקלכם בידכם ואכלתם אתו בחפזון פסח הוא ליהוה

The Priestly author of 12:1-14* integrated the ritual instructions from vv.21-27 into vv.3b, 6-8, 11bβ, which he developed into a ritual in vv.1-14*, and prefixed it to the pre-Priestly section of vv.21-27, which became an execution for the Priestly instructions in vv.1-14 with the command-execution formula in v.28. Due to the combination of ritual instructions and parenesis that interprets the Passover in the context of the Exodus and points to future observance in the land in 12:21-27, it can be presumed that the Priestly author of 12:1-14* who took up the ritual instructions and interpretation in vv.21-27 would likewise offer his own account with rituals and instructions for future observance.⁸⁹ As argued by Eckart Otto, *Numeruswechsel* often marks the intention of a composition to signal it is referring to earlier traditions and should not necessarily give grounds for literary-critical operations.⁹⁰ The use of the 3rd plural in-

⁸⁹ Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 74-78.

⁹⁰ Otto, "Priesterschrift und Deuteronomium im Buch Levitikus: Zur Integration des Deuteronomiums in den Pentateuch," in *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte* (eds. Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid; VWGTH 40; Leipzig:

structions in vv.3, 6-8 alongside the 2nd plural instructions in vv.4-6, 9-11 does not necessitate considering the 2nd plural instructions as secondary, but rather they can be considered as the Priestly alternative to the non-Priestly ritual instructions in vv.21-27.⁹¹ The inclusion of the 2nd plural instructions from vv.4-6, 9-11 in the original layer is also supported by the fact that the Priestly interpretation of the Passover in vv.12-14 continues in 2nd plural address, which makes the 3rd plural instructions stand out from the otherwise consistent 2nd plural address in vv.1-14. Therefore it is inappropriate to remove material from vv.1-14 as secondary based on the criteria that it points to a later observance of Passover that does not fit the historical situation of the night of the Passover.⁹²

Two questions can now be addressed relating to the unity of vv.1-14*. As noted above, v.14 is formulated based on the pre-Priestly v.24:

<p>והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון וחגתם אותו חג ליהוה לדרתיכם חקת עולם תחגהו</p>	<p>24</p>	<p>ושמרתם את הדבר הזה לחק לך ולבניך עד עולם</p>
--	-----------	---

The Priestly v.14 goes beyond v.24 by establishing the remembrance of the Passover (זכרון) as an annual festival חג ליהוה.⁹³ A חג that is based on the remembrance of the Passover requires a fixed date for its celebration, in contrast to festivals based on agricultural cycles. In order for Israel to remember היום הזה, there must be a fixed calendar for its observance, which leads to the question of the relationship of the establishment of the חג in v.14 to the dates found in vv.2, 3ab, and 6a. The establishment of the

Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015), 175-76.

⁹¹ So according to Crüsemann, "With very few exceptions... the essential portions of these verses, including the actual killing of the passover, are part of the basic document. We can entirely disregard here the questions, whether the priestly writings thus adopted earlier ritual texts and to what degree they can be reconstructed. In contrast, the fading away [= removal P.T.] of all provisions that formulate ritual particulars, such as, for example, the date (verses 2, 6a), the advance selection (verse 4), the unblemished state of the animal (verse 5) or the instructions regarding preparation and eating (verses 9ff.) can be seen as arguing in a circle" (*The Torah*, 297).

⁹² Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität* 74, 78.

⁹³ On the connection of זכרון as a festival, see Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 283. Likewise Holzinger argues that v.14 belongs with vv.1-13 as identifying the Passover as a one-day festival (*Exodus*, 38).

Passover as a חג is inextricably linked with the series of dates in vv.2, 3ab, and 6a, which establish an annual calendar based on the event of the Exodus and the correct dates for carrying out the ritual sequence.⁹⁴

The dates in vv.2, 3ab, and 6a however seem to fit awkwardly into the setting of the Passover night, which is why they are often removed along with v.14 as secondary.⁹⁵ However, it can also be argued that the awkwardness results from the integration of the 3rd plural ritual instructions from vv.21-23, and that the dates are original to the Priestly account, since v.14 is determined to be a part of this layer. The usual ritual language which contains a specification of a timeframe for a ritual followed by an instruction with לקח is expressed with the temporal phrase + *yiqtol* form of לקח:

Exod 12:3	בעשר לחדש הזה ויקחו להם
Lev 14:10	וביום השמיני יקח
Lev 15:14	וביום השמיני יקח לו
Lev 15:29	וביום השמיני תקח לה

According to Otto, an original וקחו from v.21 has been changed to ויקחו due to its integration with הזה לחדש הזה.⁹⁶ Thus the sequence בעשר לחדש הזה ויקחו להם can be considered appropriate.⁹⁷ The awkwardness in the syntax results from v.2 being addressed to Moses and Aaron, with v.3 introducing the commands they are to relate to

⁹⁴ Weimar, "Zum Problem," 10; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 297.

⁹⁵ So Berner (*Exoduserzählung*, 326), Gertz (*Tradition und Redaktion*, 35-36), and Köckert (*Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 94).

⁹⁶ Otto, פסח *pāsaḥ*, 10. Otto considers the possibility that the date is added by the P^G redaction (17-18). So also in the discussion by Gesundheit, who argues for a smooth connection from בעשר לחדש הזה ויקחו להם in proposing that בעשר לחדש הזה belongs to the base-layer of the Priestly account (*Three Times a Year*, 51-55).

⁹⁷ Against Weimar, who removes לאמר בעשר לחדש הזה ("Zum Problem," 4). The use of the irreal *yiqtol* can indicate either a deontic *yiqtol* or a jussive. The difference between the imperatives in the 2nd plural sequence and the irreal *yiqtol* form marks the difference between the subjective modal deixis of God's command to Moses, and the objective modality of the instructions for observing the Passover (John Cook, *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expression of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew* [LSAWS 7; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012], 333).

the people with **לאמר**. Though it is said to interrupt the typical speech-command formula in vv.1, 3 (**ויאמר יהוה אל...דברו**),⁹⁸ this can be explained contextually:

12:1		ויאמר יהוה אל משה ואל אהרן בארץ מצרים לאמר
12:2	החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים	
	ראשון הוא לכם לחדשי השנה	
12:3		דברו אל כל עדת ישראל לאמר
12:4	בעשר לחדש הזה ויקחו להם	

In vv. 1-2 YHWH speaks to Moses and Aaron and relates the information that calibrates the Israelite calendar to the Exodus event and sets the discourse-pragmatic context for the following imperative to speak to the Israelites.⁹⁹ As in ancient Near Eastern literature, such calendrical dating was esoteric knowledge for cultic professionals and not intended for the general public.¹⁰⁰ In v.3 the command of YHWH to Moses and Aaron to speak the message to the Israelites follows with **דברו אל כל עדת ישראל לאמר**, which integrates the 3rd plural ritual instructions from vv.21-23 as a divine speech into the Priestly Exodus narrative. Thus the awkward **לאמר** to introduce indirect speech results from the incorporation of the 3rd plural instructional material from vv.21-23.¹⁰¹

The establishment of the month of the Exodus departure in 12:2 with **החדש הזה** forms the foundation for preparing the lamb on the tenth of the month in v.3 (**בעשר לחדש הזה**) and slaughtering the lamb on the fourteenth of the month in v.6 (**והיה לכם למשמרת עד ארבעה עשר יום לחדש הזה**), and thus provides the calendrical basis for the future observance of the Passover as a **חג** in

⁹⁸ Noth, *Exodus*, 94; Weimar, "Zum Problem," 3.

⁹⁹ Cook, *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb*, 333.

¹⁰⁰ Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 384; Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 276.

¹⁰¹ Cf. also Num 9:2. Gesundheit's proposal of removing **לאמר** in v.3 to make a smooth connection of **דברו אל כל עדת ישראל** [לאמר] **בעשר לחדש הזה ויקחו להם** does not explain why **לאמר** would have been inserted to disrupt this connection.

v.14.¹⁰² The היום הזה in v.14 links the ritual instructions in vv.1-14 to the night of the departure in 12:41 as the day that is to be memorialized.¹⁰³ If it is recognized that vv.1-14 is based on vv.21-27 and is thus also concerned with establishing the future observance of the Passover, there are no syntactical reasons to remove the dates in vv.2, 3b, 6a even though they point beyond the contextual night of the Passover.¹⁰⁴ The address of Israel as עדת ישראל in 12:2 suggests an establishing of Israel's identity as a religious and cultic community that has been freed to serve YHWH. According to Guillaume, who traces the development of the Priestly calendar as the foundational criteria for literary criticism, the dates in Exod 12:2, 3, 6 are an integral part of the agenda of the Priestly narrative.¹⁰⁵ If it is correct that the Priestly narrative is concerned with establishing the foundations of the laws of the Holiness Code, especially the cultic calendar in Lev 23, then it makes sense to preserve the calendrical dating system that points beyond the night of the Exodus, unless there are compelling syntactical grounds to remove it.

The establishment of the calendrical dating in Exod 12:2 can be seen as an important link in the overall Priestly structuring of history with its connection to Gen 8:13 and Exod 40:17.¹⁰⁶ As noted by Dozeman, these texts provide insight into the theology of the Priestly narrative:

Gen 8:13	ויהי באחת ושש מאות שנה <u>בראשון באחד לחדש</u> חרבו המים מעל הארץ
Exod 12:2	החדש הזה לכם <u>ראש חדשים ראשון</u> הוא לכם לחדשי השנה
Exod 40:17	ויהי בחדש הראשון בשנה השנית <u>באחד לחדש</u> הוקם המשכן

¹⁰² Weimar, "Zum Problem," 4; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 35.

¹⁰³ Jacob, *Exodus*, 314.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Dillmann, *Exodus*, 112; Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 206. The Priestly composition is devaluing matzot from the DtrH tradition in favor of the Passover, and thus would require focusing the cultic calendar to the Passover (Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 275-76; Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 206-207).

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Guillaume, who includes Lev 23, 25 as part of his P^G due to the integral connections of the calendar dates (*Land and Calendar*, 89-95).

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 89-95; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 262-64; Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 383-84; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 1966.

The dates link the cessation of the flood, the Exodus departure, and the establishment of the Tabernacle to the first month of the year, with the flood cessation and the Tabernacle being established on New Year's day.¹⁰⁷ Each of these events begins a new era in the Priestly history, and together mark the Exodus event as a watershed in history. They mark a transition from the post-flood times of Noah and the subsequent Patriarchs, to the epoch of Israel, and the establishment of the dwelling of YHWH in the Tabernacle.¹⁰⁸ So according to Albertz, "die Befreiung aus Ägypten als einen so tiefgreifenden zeitlichen Einschnitt in der Geschichte Israels verstand, dass er ihm auch kalendarisch für alle Zukunft den Character einer Zeitenwende geben wolle."¹⁰⁹

The result of this analysis suggests that the Priestly account in vv.1-14 is essentially unified. The slight unevenness results from integrating the ritual instructions from the pre-Priestly account in vv.21-27, whose ritual instructions are used in vv.1-11 to form the 3rd plural instructions for the Passover that allows the Priestly account to integrate vv.21-27 as an execution report to its own instructions with v.28. The account establishes enduring foundations for the observance of the Passover for future generations, with the etiological concern of the narrative taking precedence over historical concerns in the situation in the night of the Exodus through narrative *metalepsis* that disrupts the temporal framework of the narrative.¹¹⁰ The concern of

¹⁰⁷ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 263. The Passover itself however does not occur on New Year's day, but on the 15th of the first month (Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 383; Jacob, *Exodus*, 1045). Pola also recognizes the importance of Exod 12:2 in establishing the date of Exod 40:17a, but nevertheless considers 12:2 as secondary due to its position in the text. Pola even considers that the establishment of the Tabernacle in 40:17a at Sinai allows Israel to celebrate "das erste 'richtige' Passa am 'richtigen' Ort" (*Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 341).

¹⁰⁸ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 264.

¹⁰⁹ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 206.

¹¹⁰ Jacob, *Exodus*, 291; Ilsa Müllner, "Celebration and Narration: Metaleptic Features in Exod 12:1-13:16," in *Narratology, Hermeneutics, and Midrash: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Narratives from the Late Antiquity through to Modern Times* (eds. Constanza Cordoni and Gerhard Langer; Vienna: Vienna University Press, 2014), 29; Bernd Janowski, "Was sich Wiederholt: zu einem vernachlässigten Aspekt des alttestamentlichen Zeitverständnisses," in *"Ich werde meinen Bund mit euch niemals brechen!" (Ri 2,1): Festschrift für Walter Gross zum 70. Geburtstag* (eds. Erasmus Gass and Hermann-Josef Stipp; Freiburg: Herder, 2011), 329-330; Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 289; Leonhard,

Exod 12:1-14 is to describe a חג Passover festival in Egypt, linking the temporal horizon of the narrative in Egypt with the time of the narrator and his audience.¹¹¹ The ritual reflects details that would be expected in a ritual instruction for a חג with a centralized slaughter at a temple.¹¹² The use of שחט for slaughter carried out by כל קהל suggests that it is a centralized communal event, after which the meal is eaten at homes.¹¹³ The 2nd plural ritual instructions in vv.1-14 develop the 3rd plural instructions in vv.3, 6-8 with specifications that minimize the consumption of meat (vv.4-6a) and require roasting of the Passover and complete disposal of the leftovers (vv.9-10).¹¹⁴ The structure of vv.1-14 has the closest parallel in the ritual instructions from Lev 23:10-14 with multi-staged instructions for the ritual of the Feast of First-fruits, and the correlation of the key dates to the tenth and the fourteenth days of the month reflect the same ritual sequence of initiating the ritual on the tenth day and culminating it on the fourteenth as seen in the Day of Atonement instructions in Lev 23:26-32.¹¹⁵ These similarities have led scholars to propose that the instructions for observing the Passover in Lev 23:5 are from the same literary layer as Exod 12:1-14*, and that the reason for the brevity of Lev 23:5 is that it presumes the ritual instructions from Exod 12:1-14*.¹¹⁶

"Die Erzählung Exod 12 als Festlegende für das Pesachfest am Jerusalemer Tempel," 258.

¹¹¹ Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 300; Haran, *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel* (2nd ed. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985), 347-48.

¹¹² Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 271.

¹¹³ The designation of Israel as an עדת reflects an understanding of Israel as a national, legal, and cultic community that "gathers" for worship, anticipating the future establishment of Israel as a religious community centered around the tabernacle (Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 297; Dozeman, *Exodus 1-18*, 264; Oswald and Utzschneider, 240; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 336n10; Rainer Albertz and Rüdiger Schmitt, *Family and Household Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant* [Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012], 400; Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 292-93).

¹¹⁴ As noted by Oswald and Utzschneider, these instructions can be understood from the background of countering the Deuteronomic Passover (*Exodus 1-15*, 276).

¹¹⁵ Kilchör, *Mosetora und Jahwetora*, 182.

¹¹⁶ Feucht, *Untersuchungen*, 46; Hoffmann, *Leviticus II*, 7; Kilian, *Untersuchung*, 110; Holzinger, *Exodus*, 396-98; Kilchör, *Mosetora und Jahwetora*, 182.

Lev 23:5	<u>בחדש הראשון</u>	Exod 12:2	<u>החדש הזה לכם ראש חדשים</u> <u>ראשון הוא לכם לחדשי השנה</u>
		12:6	והיה לכם משמרת <u>עד ארבעה עשר יום לחדש הזה</u> ושחטו אתו כל קהל עדת ישראל
	<u>בארבעה עשר לחדש</u>		<u>בין הערבים</u>
	<u>בין הערבים</u> <u>פסח ליהוה</u>	11bβ	<u>פסח הוא ליהוה</u>

These parallels suggest that Lev 23:5 and Exod 12:1-14 are related. This view is further supported by the evidence that the best explanation for the temporal structure of the ritual in Exod 12:1-14 with its events prescribed to the tenth and fourteenth days is that it coincides with the temporal structure of the ritual calendar and Day of Atonement in Lev 23.¹¹⁷ There are no internal contradictions between Exod 12:1-14 and Lev 23:5 that would require assigning them to different layers. Consistent with the argument developed for the Priestly narratives in Exod 1-7*, the Priestly base-layer of the Passover in Exod 12:1-14 can be understood as establishing the foundations for observing the Holiness Code laws of Passover, and also the whole calendar of H is calibrated to the calculation of months from Exod 12:2.¹¹⁸ Thus Lev 23 is dependent on the details of Exod 12:1-14, and there is no need to see a literary-critical distinction between these chapters.

The base layer of the Holiness Code narrative in Exod 12 thus contains the instructions for the Passover in vv.1-14, the execution report in v.28, as well as the itinerary recounting the departure in vv.40-41. Following the integration of the pre-Priest-

¹¹⁷ This is the most plausible explanation for the choice of the tenth and fourteenth dates in Exodus 12 (cf. Otto, *פסח pāsah*, 17-18 Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 94; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 240). So Jan Wagenaar on the relationship between Exod 12:1-14 (including vv.15-20) and the festival calendar in Lev 23: "New year on the first day, the selection of the passover-sacrifice on the tenth day, the slaughter of the passover-sacrifice on the fourteenth day and the start of the seven day festival of unleavened bread on the fifteenth day of the first month, are mirrored by the memorial day on the first day, the day of atonement on the tenth day, the start of the seven day festival of huts on the fifteenth day and an additional festival day on the twenty-second day of the seventh month." ("Passover and the First Day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread in the Priestly Festival Calendar," *VT* 64.2 [2004]: 258).

¹¹⁸ Guillaume, *Land and Calendar*, 89-95, who assigns Exod 12:1-8 and Lev 23, 25 to his P base layer due to this connection.

ly Passover account from vv.21-27, 29-33 into the Holiness Composition account of the Passover in vv.1-14, Exodus 12-13 underwent further stages of development with the addition of the Deuteronomic instructions for the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the consecration of the Firstborn. This stage is seen in the narrative notices in 12:34, 39¹¹⁹ which recount that Israel took the unleavened dough and baked unleavened cakes as they departed Egypt in haste,¹²⁰ and in the instructions for observing the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the dedication of the Firstborn in 13:3-16*.¹²¹

The analysis of Exod 13:3-16* by Gesundheit and Kilchör has shown that the instructions for the Festival of Unleavened Bread and the dedication of the Firstborn are developed from the material in 12:14, 21-27, as seen in the following chart:¹²²

Exod 12:14, 24-27	Exod 13:3, 5-9	Exod 13:10-16
14 <u>והיה היום הזה לכם לזכרון</u>	3 <u>זכור את היום הזה</u>	
24 <u>ושמרתם את הדבר הזה</u> <u>לחק לך ולבניך עד עולם</u> <u>והיה כי תבאו אל הארץ</u>	5 <u>והיה כי יביאך יהוה אל ארץ</u> <u>הכנעני והחתי והאמרי</u> <u>והחוי והיבوسی</u>	10 <u>ושמרת את החקה הזאת</u> <u>למועדה מימים ימימה</u> <u>והיה כי יבאך יהוה אל ארץ</u> <u>הכנעני</u>
25 <u>אשר יתן יהוה לכם</u> <u>כאשר דבר</u> <u>ושמרתם את העבדה הזאת</u>	<u>אשר נשבע לאבותיך לתת לך</u> <u>ארץ זבת חלב ודבש</u> <u>ועבדת את העבדה הזאת</u> <u>בחדש הזה</u>	11 <u>כאשר נשבע לך ולאבותיך</u> <u>ונתנה לך</u>
	6 <u>שבעת ימים תאכל מצת</u> <u>וביום השביעי חג ליהוה</u>	
	7 <u>מצות יאכל את שבעת הימים</u> <u>ולא יראה לך חמץ ולא יראה</u> <u>לך שאר בכל גבלך</u>	

¹¹⁹ Albrecht considers these verses part of an older tradition than vv.29-39 (*Exodus 1-18*), whereas Berner (*Exoduserzählung*, 336) and Oswald and Utzschneider (*Exodus 1-15*, 243, 25-56) consider them isolated insertions into the earlier narrative tradition that prepares for the Feast of Unleavened Bread in Exod 13.

¹²⁰ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 294; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 37.

¹²¹ There are slight disagreements over the internal layering of 13:3-16, though most scholars see the section as essentially unified (Albrecht, *Exodus 1-18*, 201; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 250; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 57-73). Oswald and Utzschneider remove vv.8-10 as secondary (*Exodus 1-15*, 269-70). Berner takes 12:34, 39; 13:3-6* as an earlier stage of material with the Unleavened Bread instructions, followed by 13:11-16* as instructions for the Firstborn dedication (*Exoduserzählung*, 293-301, 313-320).

¹²² The sections marked with single underlining are found in two of the parallel texts, and the double underlining indicates parallels in each of the three texts. Cf. Gesundheit, *Three Times a Year*, 208-213; Kilchör, *Mosetora und Jahwetora*, 175-78.

26	והיה כי יאמרו אליכם <u>בניכם</u> <u>מה העבדה הזאת</u> לכם	8	והגדת <u>לבנך</u> ביום ההוא	14	והיה כי ישאלך <u>בנך</u> מחר <u>לאמר מה זאת</u>
27	ואמרתם זבח פסח הוא <u>ליהוה</u> אשר פסח על בתי בני ישראל במצרים בנגפו את <u>מצרים</u> ואת בתינו הציל		<u>לאמר</u> בעבור זה עשה <u>יהוה</u> לי <u>בצאתי ממצרים</u>	15	ואמרת אליו בחזק יד הוציאנו <u>יהוה</u> <u>ממצרים</u> מבת עבדים ויהי כי הקשה פרעה לשלחנו ויהרג יהוה כל בכור בארץ מצרים מבכר אדם ועד בכור בהמה על כן אני זבח ליהוה כל פטר רחם הזכרים וכל בכור בני אפדה <u>והיה לאות על ידכה</u> <u>ולטוטפת בין עיניך</u>
13	והיה הדם לכם <u>לאת</u> <u>על הבתים</u>	9	והיה <u>לך לאות על ירך</u> <u>ולזכרון בין עיניך</u> למען תהיה תורת יהוה בפיך כי ביד חזקה הוצאתך <u>יהוה ממצרים</u>	16	כי בחזק יד הוציאנו <u>יהוה ממצרים</u>
14	והיה היום הזה לכם <u>לזכרון</u>				

The instructions for Firstfruits (vv.3-9) and dedication of the firstborn (vv.11-16) are closely linked with the Passover account in 12:21-27, as well as with 12:1-14.¹²³ 13:3 calls for Israel to remember "this day" (זכור את־היום הזה), recalling לכם היום הזה ויהי from 12:14, 40-41,¹²⁴ and 13:4 identifies the month of departure as חדש האביב, specifying the unnamed month in 12:2.¹²⁵ Likewise 13:9, 16 have transformed the אות and זכרון from 12:12-14 into terms for a physical marker carried on the body, which evinces connections to Deut 6:8 and 11:18.¹²⁶ The use of the אות and זכרון here however indicate an inner disposition to remember the Exodus. These modifications suggest that Exod 13:1-16 has been conceived as a Deuteronomic alternative to the Passover in 12:1-14, which introduces the Feast of Unleavened Bread and the dedication of the Firstborn as the way to memorialize the Exodus. The divine speech in 13:1-2 that introduces the commandments develops the concept of the killing of the firstborn expressed in 12:12 into a foundation for consecration of the Israelite first-

¹²³ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 201; Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 309.

¹²⁴ Müllner, "Celebration and Narration," 35.

¹²⁵ Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 309; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 294.

¹²⁶ Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 311-12.

born.¹²⁷ In its present condition, 13:1-2 prepares for the instructions for the consecration of the firstborn in vv.11-16 and in Deut 15:19-23 (קדש in Exod 13:2; Deut 15:19) as carried out in 13:11-16.¹²⁸ Exodus 13:3-16 along with Exod 12:21-27 function to provide the regulations in Deut 15:19-23; 16:1-8 "a historical-theological justification" within the context of the Deuteronomistic history, associating the dedication of the firstborn, the Matzot festival, and the Passover.¹²⁹

Following the introduction of the Festival of Unleavened Bread and Dedication of Firstborn in 13:1-16, it is widely agreed that the Priestly literature responded with its own account of the festival of Unleavened Bread in vv.15-20*,¹³⁰ within which verses 15-17 and 18-20 reflect two stages of development.¹³¹ Exod 12:15-17 coincide with the instructions for observing the Feast of Unleavened Bread in the Holiness Code in Lev 23:6-8, and also develop the instructions for Unleavened Bread from 13:3, 6-7, 10:

Lev 23:6-8	Exod 12:15-17	Exod 13:3, 6-7, 10
ובחמשה עשר יום לחדש הזה 6 חג המצות ליהוה <u>שבעת ימים מצות תאכלו</u>	15 <u>שבעת ימים מצות תאכלו</u> אך ביום הראשון תשביתו <u>שאר</u> מבתים כי כל-אכל <u>חמץ</u> ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מישראל מיום הראשון עד-יום השבעי	6 <u>שבעת ימים תאכל מצת</u> וביום השביעי חג ליהוה מצות יאכל את שבעת הימים 7 ולא-יראה לך <u>חמץ</u> ולא-יראה לך <u>שאר</u> בכל-גבלך
7 <u>ביום הראשון מקרא קדש</u> <u>יהיה לכם</u> <u>כל מלאכת עבדה לא תעשו</u>	16 <u>וביום הראשון מקרא קדש</u>	

¹²⁷ Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 272.

¹²⁸ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 219.

¹²⁹ Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 274. On the Deuteronomic character of the passage, see Dozeman, *Exodus*, 290-95; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 35-37, 167-68.

¹³⁰ Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 320.

¹³¹ Against Nihan, who argues for a unified vv.14-20 (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 564-65). Advocating an understanding of two stages of growth are Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 247; Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 35-37, 68-69, 72-73; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 90-96. According to Knohl, vv.1-17 form an original strata of HS material, followed by a later addition of vv.18-20 (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 19-21).

8	והקרבתם אשה ליהוה שבעת ימים <u>ביום השביעי מקרא קדש</u> <u>כל מלאכת עבדה לא תעשו</u>	<u>וביום השביעי מקרא קדש</u> <u>יהיה לכם</u> <u>כל-מלאכה לא-יעשה בהם</u> אך אשר יאכל לכל-נפש הוא לבדו יעשה לכם 17 <u>ושמרתם את-המצות</u> <u>כי בעצם היום הזה</u> <u>הוצאתי את-עבאوتיכם</u> <u>מארץ מצרים</u> <u>ושמרתם את-היום הזה</u> <u>לדרתיכם חקת עולם</u>	10 <u>ושמרת את-החקה הזאת</u> למועדה מימים ימימה 3 <u>זכור את-היום הזה</u> <u>אשר יצאתם ממצרים</u>
---	---	--	--

From this chart it is apparent that Exod 12:15-17 takes up the regulations for observing the feast of Unleavened Bread from Lev 23:6-8 and conflates them with the concern to remove leaven from the houses of the Israelites seen in Exod 13:7, sharpened with a threat of being "cut off" from among the people (Exod 12:15) and an allowance to break the prohibition of כל מלאכת עבדה in Lev 23:7-8 in order to prepare the required food in the context of the Exodus (12:16).¹³² Exodus 12:17 goes beyond Lev 23:5-8 by utilizing the parenthesis of 13:3-10 to make Unleavened Bread in vv.15-17 included as part of the remembrance of the Exodus in Exod 12:1-14 with the repetition of לדרתיכם חקת עולם from 12:14.¹³³ Thus Exod 12:15-17 reflects a post-Holiness Code layer of activity, by an author nevertheless in the "school" of the Holiness Code. The purpose of this author was to respond to the instructions of the Feast of Unleavened Bread in 13:1-16* by providing regulations for the observance of the festival in line with the Holiness Code in Lev 23:6-8 and in doing so to combine the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread into a unified festival commemorating the Exodus.¹³⁴

¹³² On how Exod 12:14-20 go beyond Lev 23:6-8, see the discussion in Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 564-65.

¹³³ Otto, "Innerbiblische Exegese," 156-57.

¹³⁴ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 565.

Following the insertion of 12:15-17, vv.18-20 were added, which can likewise broadly be considered from the Holiness school. This author links the observance of the Feast of Unleavened Bread to the same fourteenth day of the month on which the Passover took place (12:18; cf. v.6) and thus goes beyond Lev 23:5, 6 and Exod 12:1-14 + 15-17 in establishing an explicit date for eating the Unleavened Bread, the day after the Passover on the fourteenth.¹³⁵ This dating is consistent with the combination of Passover and the Unleavened Bread in Ezek 45:21:

Exod 12:18	Ezek 45:21
בראשון בארבעה עשר יום לחדש בערב	בראשון בארבעה עשר יום לחדש
תאכלו מצת	יהיה לכם הפסח חג
עד יום האחד ועשרים לחדש בערב	שבעות ימים מצות יאכל

The unusual בראשון בארבעה עשר יום לחדש is found typically in Ezekiel, and only in Exod 12:18 and Ezek 45:21 is it related to the combination of the Passover and Unleavened Bread. Therefore it is likely that 12:18-20 were added as a more complete identification of the Passover and Unleavened Bread with a melding of the day of eating Unleavened Bread to the fourteenth of the month to align it with the dating system and instructions of Ezek 45:21.¹³⁶

The latest Priestly literary activity in Exod 12 is found in vv.43-51, which is a חקת הפסח instruction from YHWH to Moses and Aaron regarding who is allowed to participate in the Passover ritual.¹³⁷ The text is marked out as a later insertion by the *Wiederaufnahme* in 12:50-51 that takes up the earlier frame markers in the Passover narrative from vv.28, 41.¹³⁸

¹³⁵ For a discussion of the different dating, see Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 324.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 324-25; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 19-21.

¹³⁷ The identical opening of 12:1 and 12:43 suggests that the instructions in vv.43-51 are to be seen as attaining equal authority to those in 12:1-14 (Jacob, *Exodus*, 352).

¹³⁸ Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 331.

וילכו ויעשו בני ישראל כאשר צוה יהוה את־משה ואהרן כן עשו 12:28
 ויהי בעצם היום הזה יצאו כל־צבאות יהוה מארץ מצרים 12:41
 12:42 Night of watching
 חקת הפסח 12:43-49
 ויעשו כל־בני ישראל כאשר צוה יהוה את־משה ואת־אהרן כן עשו 12:50
 ויהי בעצם היום הזה הוציא יהוה את־בני ישראל מארץ מצרים על־צבאתם 12:51

The חקת הפסח shares the concerns of the Holiness Code to define participation in rituals for non-Israelites living among Israel.¹³⁹ The strange location of the passage is best explained by the statement preceding it in 12:38, according to which a "mixed multitude" (ערב רב) of non-Israelites accompanied Israel in the Exodus.¹⁴⁰ The inclusion of the mixed multitude in 12:38 is itself a later addition to the context, likely intended to prepare for the later H text in Lev 24:10-23 where there is a legal case involving a man of mixed Israelite-Egyptian descent.¹⁴¹ Placing the addition in vv.43-49 fits in with the narrative logic of the night of the Exodus: the initial Passover would not have included foreigners, but only once Israel departed Egypt did non-Israelites decide to join them, thus giving rise to the need for additional legislation for future observance including the mixed multitudes.¹⁴²

In summary, the stages of the development of Exodus 12-13 are proposed as follows: Exodus 12:29-39* form the earliest narrative of the killing of the firstborn as the final plague. To this was added the pre-Priestly apotropaic blood ritual in vv.21-27 with parenesis for observance in future generations. The Priestly passover account in 12:1-14 integrated the killing of the firstborn from vv.29-39* with the apotropaic ritual from vv.21-27 into the overarching theology of the Priestly narrative, making the

¹³⁹ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 566-67.

¹⁴⁰ So Levin, *Der Jahwist*, 339-400. Cf. also Gertz, *Tradition und Redaktion*, 57n124; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 285; Berner, Childs, *Exodus*, 202; Oswald and Utzschneider, *Exodus 1-15*, 258; Fischer and Markl, *Exodus*, 142.

¹⁴¹ Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 273. Lev 24:10-23 is widely considered to be a later addition to the Holiness Code (Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 512-13). Alberty (Exodus 1-18, 217) and Noth (*Exodus*, 99) associate 12:38 with the grumbling of the crowd in Num 11:4.

¹⁴² Childs, *Exodus*, 202.

event a culmination of the great judgments promised at the beginning of the plague narratives (6:6; 7:4; 12:12) and making the blood ritual and Passover observance a sign in line with Priestly signs in Gen 9:11-16 and 17:9-14, by which Israel memorializes for perpetuity YHWH's remembrance of his covenant with the patriarchs in saving Israel from Egypt (Exod 2:24-25; 12:12-14). This account of the Priestly Passover in 12:1-14 aligns with the festival calendar of the Holiness Code in Lev 23:5, and provides the details missing there to perform the Passover as a חג. This understanding of vv.1-14 is consistent with the Priestly narratives in Exod 1-14 as part of the H-Composition. Following the Holiness Composition's establishment of the Passover in 12:1-14, the Deuteronomic Feast of Unleavened Bread and dedication of the firstborn were added in 13:1-16 in order to establish the foundations for the festival in Deut 16, building on the language of Exod 12:21-27 and 12:1-14. The Holiness School then responded with instructions for the Feast of Unleavened Bread in 12:15-17, aligned with Lev 23:6-8 but going beyond it in integrating aspects from Exod 13. A later stage of Holiness School instruction was added in 12:18-20, coinciding with the complete conjoining of the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread seen in Ezek 45:21. Finally, following the addition of the notice that a "mixed multitude" departed from Egypt (12:38), the Holiness School added instructions for the observance of the Passover by non-Israelites in 12:43-49.

5.2.4 Exodus 14

Following the Passover and the departure from Egypt, Israel makes its way to the Sea of Reeds. There is general agreement as to what encompasses the Priestly portions of Exod 14.¹⁴³ Though there is debate over whether the Priestly version of the

¹⁴³ See the slightly varying delineations of Gertz, 14:1,2abα, 3, 4, 8a, 10abβ, 15, 16*, 17abα, 18a, 21aα*, 21b, 22, 23aα, 26, 27aα*, 28a, 29 (*Tradition und Redaktion*, 396); Berner, 14:1,2a,4, 8a,

Sea miracle should be considered a redaction or an independent source,¹⁴⁴ its significance in the overall Priestly narrative of Exod 1-14 is not affected by this decision.

The Priestly and non-Priestly reports of the Sea Miracle represent two accounts with different emphases.¹⁴⁵

Two particular emphases emerge from the Priestly account of the crossing of the Sea. First, the occasion is the culmination of the motif of the recognition of YHWH that the Egyptians experience from the intervention of YHWH to save the Israelites, initiated in 7:5.¹⁴⁶

Exod 7:5	<u>וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה בנטתי את־ידי על־מצרים</u> <u>והוצאתי את־בני־ישראל מתוכם</u>
Exod 14:4	<u>וחזקתי את־לב־פרעה ורדף אחריהם ואכבדה בפרעה ובכל־חילו</u> <u>וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה</u>
Exod 14:18	<u>וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה בהכבדי בפרעה ברכבו ובפרשיו</u>

The culmination of the Sea miracle places the Priestly Exodus narrative Exod 1-14* under the motif of the recognition of YHWH, both for Israel (Exod 6:6; 12:12) and the Egyptians and Pharaoh (7:5; 14:4, 18). This motif of the recognition of YHWH also introduces the concept of the glory (כבוד vv.4, 18) of YHWH that will be developed further in the Priestly narrative (cf. Exod 16 discussed below).¹⁴⁷

10a, bβ, 15, 16*, 17abα, 18a, 21aab, 22-23aab, 26abα, 27aα, 28-29 (*Exoduserzählung*, 403-405); Oswald and Utzschneider, 14:1-4, 7-9, 15-18, 21aα, 21b-23, 26-27aα, 28-29 (*Exodus 1-15*, 304-314); Albertz, 14:1-4, 8-10a, bβ, 15-18, 21aα, 21b-23, 26-27aα, 28-29 (*Exodus 1-18*, 226-27); Dozeman, 13:18b, 21-22; 14:1-4, 8b, 9b, 16ab, 17-18, 19b, 20ab,b, 21b, 22b, 24ab, 29b (*Exodus*, 303); Childs, 13:20; 14:1-4, 8, 9aβb, 15-18, 21aab, 22-23, 26, 27a, 28-29 (*Exodus*, 220); Propp, 14:1-4, 8-9, 15-18, 21a, bβ, 22-23, 26-27a, 28a, 29 (*Exodus 1-18*, 461-63); Römer, 14:1, 2*, 3-4, 8-10a, 15*, 16*, 17-18, 21a*, b, 22-23, 26-27a, 28-29 ("Von Moses Berufung zur Spaltung des Meers," 157-58); Jeon, 14:1-4, 8-9, 10*, 15-18, 21-23*, 26-27aα*, 28-29 (*The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story*, 179-80).

¹⁴⁴ See Berner, "Die literarische Character der Priesterschrift in der Exoduserzählung," 123-130 arguing for a redaction, and Römer, "Von Moses Berufung zur Spaltung des Meers," 157-59 arguing against.

¹⁴⁵ For discussions, see Kohata, *Jahwist und Priesterschrift*, 296-301; Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 400. In the pre-Priestly account, the battle is presented as the beginning of the wilderness wandering, and the sea is parted by a strong wind blowing through the night at the command of YHWH, whereas in the Priestly account, Moses brings about the parting of the sea, and the battle is presented as the culmination of YHWH's conflict with Pharaoh (Dozeman, *Exodus*, 303-4; Berner, *Exoduserzählung*, 400).

¹⁴⁶ Fischer and Markl, *Exodus*, 159; Childs, *Exodus*, 140, 223.

¹⁴⁷ Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 157-58. In the Priestly account, Israel is led

A second distinctive feature of the Priestly Sea miracle is its emphasis on creation theology, with links to the Priestly creation in Gen 1:1–2:4a and flood in Gen 6-9.¹⁴⁸ The concept of separation (בדל in Gen 1; בקע in Exod 14:16, 21), dry ground as conducive to life (יבשה Gen 1:9-10; Exod 14:16, 22, 29), and life as emerging from the midst of the sea with בתוך הים (Gen 1:6; Exod 14:16, 22, 23, 27) suggest that the Priestly account of Exod 14 uses terminology from the Priestly creation and flood narratives to portray Israel's deliverance through the Sea as a new creation.¹⁴⁹ The passing through the sea for Israel is thus an "ur-geschichtlicher" event with mythical connotations rooted in creation theology.¹⁵⁰ The "new creation" of Israel as a nation¹⁵¹ in the Priestly account in Exod 14* is a fitting culmination to the narrative arch introduced in Exod 1:7, where Pharaoh's oppression of Egypt is introduced as "anti-creational" suppression of the creational blessings.¹⁵² In the words of Terence Fretheim, Pharaoh is the "historical embodiment of cosmic forces of evil, threatening to undo God's creation," and thus the salvation of Israel at the Sea is a "cosmic" event that establishes the conditions for Israel's "fundamental purposes for life and well-being inherent in the creation of the world."¹⁵³ The deliverance is thus the concluding act of YHWH remembering his covenant with the Patriarchs (Exod 2:23aβ-25) and rescuing Israel out

by the כבוד cloud, rather than a messenger of YHWH (Dozeman, *Exodus*, 304).

¹⁴⁸ Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 156; Römer, "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document," 168.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 168; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 304.

¹⁵⁰ Ernst Axel Knauf, "Der Exodus zwischen Mythos und Geschichte: Zur priesterschriftlichen Rezeption der Schilfmeer-Geschichte in Exod 14," in *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag* (ed. Reinhard Kratz, Thomas Krüger, and Konrad Schmid; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000), 77; Römer, "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document," 168.

¹⁵¹ On Exod 14 as the "birth of the people," see Fischer and Markl, *Exodus*, 161; J.L. Ska, *La Passage de la Mer. Étude de la construction, du style et de la symbolique d'Exod 14:1-31* (CAB 109; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 103-105, 175.

¹⁵² Fretheim, *God and World in the Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation* (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005), 123-26.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 124.

of Egypt, which restores the possibility of the creational blessings for Israel (Exod 1:7) that will ultimately be realized in the promised land (Exod 6:2-8).

5.3. The Function of the Priestly Material in its Context

The preceding section has identified the layers within the Priestly literature of Exodus 1-14, and suggested that the base layer is aligned consistently with the Holiness Code. This proposal will be further corroborated here in showing how the function of the Priestly texts in their non-Priestly contexts aligns with the purposes of the Holiness Code. The following chart illustrates how the Priestly portions of Exod 1-14* function to enrich their contexts with its peculiar concerns:

Exodus Priestly texts:	Enrichment to the Non-Priestly Context, with links to the Holiness Code and Composition:
1:7	Israel fulfills creational blessing (Gen 1:28; Lev 26:9)
1:13-14	Egyptian oppression characterized as anti-creational (Gen 1:28) and illegal activity using terms from slave laws in Lev 25:43, 46, 53
2:23-25a β	The salvation of Israel based on God remembering His covenant with the Patriarchs (Gen 17; Lev 26:42-45)
6:2-8	Revelation of the name and authority of YHWH (Gen 17; Lev 17-26 parenthesis "I am YHWH"), Connection to Patriarchal history and pointing forward to Exod 29:45-46, Exodus as the result of YHWH remembering covenant, promise of land to future Israel
6:9-7:7*	Recognition of YHWH for Israelites established as the main theme framing the non-Priestly plagues (Holiness parenthesis to know YHWH in Lev 17-26)
12:1-14, 15-17,	Establishment of foundations for observance of the Passover in Lev 23:5 The Holiness School counterpart to the Deuteronomistic Feast of Unleavened Bread, close to Lev 23:6-8
18-20,	Alignment with Unleavened Bread from Ezek 45:21
43-49	Addition following the inclusion of mixed multitudes in Exod 12:38
14*	Salvation of Israel culminates in the Egyptians coming to know YHWH (14:4, 18) The parting of the sea is a cosmic event of new creation using language from the Holiness Composition Primeval history (Gen 1; 6-9)

5.4. The Holiness Code in Exod 1-14*

How then can the Priestly texts in 1:7, 13-14; 2:23a β -25; 6:2-7:7*; 12*; 14* be seen as functioning in their context as part of the Holiness Composition related to

Lev 17-26?¹⁵⁴ Each of these texts is intricately connected with the Holiness Code, not only in vocabulary, themes, and theology, but with similar functions as was seen in the discussion of Gen 1:1–2:4a in relation to the Holiness Code. The H-texts from Exod 1:7, 13-14; 2:23aβ-25; 6:2–7:7*; 12*; 14* function on two levels in relation to Lev 17-26. The first level is theological or philosophical, as establishing the conceptual foundations for the observance of the laws of the Holiness Code.¹⁵⁵ The perspective of the Exodus from Exod 1:7; 2:23aβ-25; 6:2–7:7*; 14* points back to the H text of Gen 1:1–2:4a and presents the salvation of the Israelites as connected to creation and covenant theology, as an event that establishes the identity of Israel as the people of YHWH and who thus have a responsibility of obedience to the covenant. The Exodus is a foundational event in forming the identity of Israel,¹⁵⁶ and the Priestly texts in Exod 1-14* define this identity particularly in terms relevant to the polity and theology of Israel as defined in the Holiness Code. Exodus 6:2–7:7* is the central text in this regard. Read in connection with the pre-Priestly call narrative in Exod 3-4, the revelation of YHWH in 6:2-8 adds marked theological aspects that show who YHWH is for Israel.¹⁵⁷ The divine speech in 6:2-8 goes beyond the account in Exod 3-4¹⁵⁸ and

¹⁵⁴ Against the analysis by Knohl, who considers within Exod 1-14 the following texts to be assigned to H: Exod 4:21b; 6:2-7:6*; 9:35; 10:1-2, 20-23, 27; 11:9-10; 12:1-20, 43-49, I argue that the outline of the Priestly base-layer delineated here should be assigned to H (Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 104). Against Knohl, (and also Milgrom) it is incoherent to assign Exod 6:2-8 to H, and not consider the intricately connected Exod 1:7, 13-14; 2:23aβ-25 as likewise belonging to the same layer. In this regard, Thomas King is more consistent in his analysis in considering Exod 1:1-7, 13-14; 2:23-25; 6:2-8, 28-30; 7:1-6, 17a, 19-20a, 21b-22; 8:1-3, 12-14, 18 (MT); 10:2; 11:9-10; 12:1-20, 49; 14:1-4, 15-18 as part of H (*The Realignment of the Priestly Literature*, 125-151).

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Firmage on Gen 1:1–2:4a as establishing the "philosophical underpinnings" of the laws of the Holiness Code ("Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda," 110).

¹⁵⁶ Franz Greifenhagen, *Egypt on the Pentateuch's Ideological Map: Constructing Biblical Israel's Identity* (JSOTSup 361; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 8-12.

¹⁵⁷ Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 206, 216; Diesel, *Ich Bin Jahwe*, 109.

¹⁵⁸ The relationship between Exod 3-4 and the Priestly account in 6:2-8 is a debated question. Various perspectives on the question are found in *Farewell to the Yahwist: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation* (eds. Thomas Dozeman and Konrad Schmid; Atlanta: SBL Press, 2006). Articles by Konrad Schmid ("The So-Called Yahwist and the Literary Gap Between Genesis and Exodus") and Jan Christian Gertz ("The Transition between the Books of Genesis and Exodus") represent a post-Priestly assignment of Exod 3-4*, and David Carr ("What is Required to Identify Pre-Priestly Narrative Connections between Genesis and Exodus?") and Thomas Dozeman

places the Exodus in the context of YHWH remembering his covenant with Israel and saving Israel from Egypt as a prerequisite for the fulfillment of the promises to the Patriarchs as a quintessential revelation of who YHWH is for Israel.¹⁵⁹ YHWH is the redeemer who takes Israel to be his people and brings Israel into the promised land, with the land at the heart of the identity of Israel's relationship to God and the prerequisite for obedience to the commandments. The revelation of YHWH with the fourfold *אני יהוה* establishes the authority of YHWH as the God of Israel, and the land of Canaan as the possession of YHWH that is granted to Israel.¹⁶⁰ As Diesel has argued, Exod 6:2-8 points forward to Sinai by establishing the foundations for God's commands to follow by initiating the history of YHWH with Israel, which is recalled in the Holiness Code as the main rationale for obedience.¹⁶¹ The theology of Exod 6:2-8 is thus foundational for the ethical parenesis in the Holiness Code, which is filled with linguistic ties to Exod 6:2-8. Leviticus 18:2-5 is the first occurrence of *אני יהוה* in the Holiness Code, and is the only speech introduction with *אני יהוה*, and thus it links back to Exod 6:2-8, which is also a speech introduction.¹⁶² All subsequent *אני יהוה* statements in the Holiness Code look back to it as establishing the identity of YHWH as the God of the Exodus and authority behind all subsequent laws.¹⁶³ The commands

("The Commission of Moses and the Book of Genesis") a pre-Priestly assignment. Following the arguments of Carr, Dozeman, Jean-Louis Ska ("Quelques remarques sur P^G et la dernière rédaction du Pentateuque," in *Le Pentateuque en question: Les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes* [ed. A. de Pury; Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989], 99-107), and most recently Jaeyoung Jeon (*The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story*, 191-93, 200-207), the Priestly portions in Exod 2:23aβ-25 and 6:2-8 are better understood as supplements that enrich Exod 3-4. As pointed out by Ska, the text is best understood as a response to the preceding events of Exod 3-5, where Moses is affirmed in His mission to free Israel, and Pharaoh receives a response to his question, "who is YHWH?" (5:2).

¹⁵⁹ Dohmen, *Exodus 1-18*, 205-206.

¹⁶⁰ Diesel, *Ich bin Jahwe*, 184-85.

¹⁶¹ Ibid., 198. This use of the self-revelation statement coincides with ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions that refer to the authority of a monarch (277).

¹⁶² Ibid., 246. The speech introduction and subsequent commandments of Lev 18:2-5 blends the historical situation of the speech introduction of Exod 6:2-8 with the Decalogue opening and commandments in Exod 20:2.

¹⁶³ Ibid., 250.

of the Holiness Code originate with the God who has saved Israel in the Exodus, and are grounded in the "Indikativ der Heilstat des Exodus."¹⁶⁴ The *אני יהוה* statements permeate the Holiness Code, recalling the authority of YHWH as the God who has freed Israel from Egypt and set them apart from other nations. The Exodus is viewed as a "Heiligung" of Israel, who are to be distinct from the Egyptians and the Canaanites (Lev 18:2-5).¹⁶⁵ The Holiness Code concludes in Lev 26:1-2 with YHWH's exclusive claim on Israel, and Lev 26:44-45 concludes the speech introduced in Lev 18:2-5 with a concluding *אני יהוה* statement. The ending of the Holiness Code recalls the close historical connection between YHWH and Israel, reminding Israel of YHWH's exclusive claim to authority and Israel's identity and responsibility as the people of YHWH.¹⁶⁶ The historical relationship between YHWH and Israel initiated at Exod 6:2-8 thus permeates Lev 17-26 and comes to fruition in Lev 26, where the hope for the future restoration of Israel lies in the identity of YHWH as the God who brought Israel out of Egypt (Lev 26:44-45).

The Priestly narratives in Exod 1-14 are thus foundational for the Holiness Code as a paradigm of salvation that is utilized in Lev 26. The salvation of Israel enables them to experience the creational blessing of being fruitful and multiplying (Exod 1:7) in their own promised land. The goal of salvation is the fulfillment of the promises of God to be fruitful and multiply and fill the earth, as well as for Israel to have their own land in which to dwell, as promised to the patriarchs (Gen 17; Exod

¹⁶⁴ Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 408. For connections of *אני יהוה* to the Exodus from Egypt, see Lev 19:36; 22:33, 43; 25:38, 55; 26:13, 45.

¹⁶⁵ Frank Crüsemann, "Der Exodus als Heiligung: zur rechtsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung des Heiligkeitgesetzes," in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard Stegemann; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990), 127-28; Diesel, *Ich bin Jahwe*, 246-50.

¹⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 271-77.

6:2-8). This perspective of history and salvation is paralleled in Lev 26, the climactic chapter of the Holiness Code:

Exodus	Leviticus
1:7 <u>ובני ישראל פרו וישרצו וירבו</u>	26:9 <u>ופניתי אליכם והפריתי אתכם</u>
2:23 ויעצמו בממד מאד ותמלא הארץ אתם	<u>והרביתי אתכם והקימתי את־בריתי אתכם</u>
<u>וישמע אלהים את־נאקתם</u>	26:42 <u>וזכרתי את־בריתי יעקב</u>
<u>ויזכר אלהים את־בריתו</u>	<u>ואף את־בריתי יצחק ואף את־בריתי אברהם אזכר</u>
<u>את־אברהם את־יצחק ואת־יעקב</u>	26:45 <u>וזכרתי להם ברית ראשנים אשר הוצאתי־אתם</u>
	מארץ מצרים לעיני הגוים
	להיות להם לאלהים אני יהוה
6:4 <u>הקמתי את בריתי אתם</u>	26:9 <u>והקימתי את־בריתי אתכם</u>
6:7 <u>ולקחתי אתכם לי לעם</u>	26:12 <u>והייתי לכם לאלהים</u>
<u>והייתי לכם לאלהים</u>	<u>ואתם תהיו לי לעם</u>
<u>וידעתם כי אני יהוה אלהיכם המוציא אתכם</u>	26:13 <u>אני יהוה אלהיכם אשר הוצאתי אתכם</u>
<u>מתחת סבלות מצרים</u>	<u>מארץ מצרים מהיות להם עבדים</u>
7:5 <u>וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה</u>	26:45 <u>וזכרתי להם ברית ראשנים</u>
<u>בנטתי את־ידי על־מצרים</u>	<u>אשר הוצאתי־אתם</u>
<u>והוצאתי את־בני־ישראל מתוכם</u>	<u>מארץ מצרים לעיני הגוים</u>
14:4 <u>וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה</u>	<u>להיות להם לאלהים אני יהוה</u>
14:18 <u>וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה</u>	

As has been argued by scholars such as Blum, Rendtorff, and Albertz, Lev 26 is a climactic text in the Priestly composition that draws together key elements from the Priestly texts in Gen-Exod.¹⁶⁷ The chapter, which is formulated as an ancient Near Eastern treaty conclusion with blessings and curses related to observance of the treaty, can be divided into the following structure:

- Lev 26:1-2: Decalogic Prologue: Idolatry, Sabbath, Sanctuary
- Lev 26:3-13 Blessings for Obedience
- Lev 26:14-39 Curses for Disobedience
- Lev 26:40-46 Hope of Restoration

If Israel is obedient to the commandments, then YHWH will bless them with the blessings of creation (26:9), and YHWH will dwell among Israel as a fulfillment of Exod 29:45-46 (26:11 ונתתי משכני בתוכם). If they are not, then they will suffer the frustration of the blessings of creation (vv.14-39). The restoration of Israel will be enabled by repentance and YHWH remembering His promises, restoring Israel in a public dis-

¹⁶⁷ Rendtorff contends for the importance of the connections of Lev 26:9-13, 42-45 with Gen 1, 17; Exod 1:7; 25:8; 29:45, which he states contain "intertextual signs showing that there are theological and literary concepts embracing the Pentateuch as a whole" ("Is it possible to read Leviticus as a separate book?" 33-34).

play of power as in Exodus 1-14, bringing them out "before the eyes of the nations" (v.45).

The second level of function of the Priestly narratives in Exod 1-14 is comparable to the function of Gen 1:1–2:4a in establishing the observance of the festivals (1:14) and the Sabbath (2:1-4a). This function of narrative explains the emergence of the Holiness Code legislation, particularly paradigmatic events that result in formulating laws for slavery (Exod 1:13-14 related to Lev 25:43, 46, 53) and redemption (Exod 6:2-8 related to Lev 25:25-26, 30, 33, 48, 54), or the founding moments of cultic laws (Exod 12* related to Lev 23:5-8). The narratives inculcate the laws by providing illustrations of them, and show how law emerges from life, as the Torah uses narratives to motivate obedience.¹⁶⁸ This is seen in three ways in Exod 1-14: First, the description of Israel's slavery in Egypt in 1:13-14 has remarkable similarities with the slave laws in Lev 25:43, 46, 53, which each use the rare word פֶּרֶךְ, the term עֶבֶד, and references to Egypt to prohibit harsh treatment of slaves. According to Greenberg, Exod 1:13-14 belongs to the "same body of material as Leviticus 25," which with its narrative links to law bears "a relation to Lev 25 somewhat like the relation of the narrative of Gen 2:1-4 to later Sabbath laws" and functions to "give the proper overtone" to the laws in Lev 25.¹⁶⁹ The language of Exod 1:13-14 anticipates the laws of slavery in Lev 25 in order to highlight the violent and illegal nature of the Egyptian oppression, which in conjunction with Exod 1:7 is understood as contrary to creational blessings.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁸ Fretheim, *Exodus*, 206-208.

¹⁶⁹ Greenberg, *Understanding Exodus*, 53.

¹⁷⁰ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 61, 72.

A second point in which Exod 1-14 relates to the laws of the Holiness Code is in the description of the salvation of Israel as redemption (גאל) by YHWH in Exod 6:2-8 in terms of YHWH carrying out a kinship duty.¹⁷¹ Related to this is also the principle of YHWH's ownership of the land established in Exod 6:2-8. The term occurs in the non-Priestly Song of the Sea (Exod 15:13) to describe the redemption of Israel from Egypt, after which it is found in the laws of redemption in Lev 25:25-26, 30, 33, 48, 54 a total of ten times. The basic principle is found in Lev 25:25: if a kinsman (אח) becomes impoverished and must sell his land holdings (אחזה), the nearest kinsman redeemer (גאל הקרב) is required to redeem the property. This is connected to the notion of YHWH's ownership of the land (Lev 25:23), according to which Israelite families cannot be alienated from their ancestral land. The similarities of theme and language in Exod 6:2-8 with the laws of Lev 25 has often been noted, and several scholars have proposed an intentional relationship between the texts.¹⁷² The redemption laws of Lev 25 are based on the principle of imitating YHWH's redemption of Israel in Exod 6:2-8.¹⁷³ The exodus event in Exod 6:2-8 is a change of ownership from Israel as slaves to Pharaoh, to establishing Israel's identity as the people of YHWH. The collective participation of every Israelite in the Exodus gives every Israelite the same dignity and equal status as the people of God, which serves as the foundation for interpersonal ethics in the Holiness Code.¹⁷⁴ Thus the description of the Exodus in Exod 6:2-8 is foundational for Israelite interpersonal ethics regarding slavery and redemption in Lev 25.

¹⁷¹ Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 273.

¹⁷² So for example W. Schmidt, *Exodus*, 285; Baentsch, *Exodus-Leviticus*, 47; Klostermann, "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz," 377; Houtman, *Exodus II*, 502; Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 330-33; Fischer and Markl, *Exodus*, 90-91.

¹⁷³ Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 333; Milgrom, *Lev 17-22*, 1408.

¹⁷⁴ Crüsemann, "Exodus als Heiligung," 127-28; Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 281, 330-333; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 256.

Finally, Exod 12:1-14, 15-20, 43-49 establish the basis for future observance of the Passover and Feast of Unleavened Bread. Exodus 12:1-14 can be understood as the founding narrative for the Passover festival prescribed in Lev 23:5. This applies also to the whole calendrical system of the Holiness Code in Lev 23, which is calibrated to the calculation of months from Exod 12:2. Thus Lev 23 is dependent on the details of Exod 12:1-14, and there is no need to see a literary-critical distinction between these chapters. The absence of detailed ritual instructions for observing the Passover in Lev 23:5 suggests that the instructions from Exod 12:1-14 are presupposed in Lev 23:5. The ensuing regulations for the Festival of Unleavened Bread in Exod 12:15-17 on the other hand are closely related to the instructions for the festival in Lev 23:6-8, but reflect a stage of development beyond Lev 23:6-8, which has integrated details from the non-Priestly account of the Festival of Unleavened Bread in Exod 13. As such it can nevertheless be considered part of the Holiness School, as largely consistent with the conception of Lev 23:6-8, but later than Lev 23:6-8.

This analysis of Exod 1:13-14; 6:2-8; 12:1-14 has shown that these texts are intricately linked to various laws in the Holiness Code in peculiar language as well as content. Adding to this the fact that 1:7; 2:23a β -25; 6:2-7:7*; 14* are tied to the H creation account in Gen 1:1–2:4a and are paradigmatic for the salvation of Israel in Lev 26, it results that all of the texts assigned to the Priestly narrative in Exod 1-14* have a demonstrable function as part of the Holiness Composition, connected with the laws and parenesis of the Holiness Code.

Chapter 6

The Holiness Composition in Exod 16-40: Keep my Sabbaths and Revere my Sanctuary

6.1 The Priestly texts in Exodus 16-40

The salvation of Israel in Exod 14-15 is the structural turning point in the Book of Exodus. Following the Song of the Sea in Exodus 15, the focus shifts towards the covenant and revelation of the law at Sinai in Exod 19-40. Before arriving at Sinai, Exod 16-18 recounts events from Israel's wilderness wanderings. As noted by Cornelius Houtman, beginning with Exod 15:25-26 Israel is introduced to the concept of divine instruction:¹

שם שם לו חק ומשפט ושם נסהו ויאמר אם־שמוע תשמע לקול יהוה אלהיך
והישר בעיניו תעשה והאזנת למצותיו ושמרת כל־חקיו
כל־המחלה אשר־שמתני במצרים לא־אשים עליך כי אני יהוה רפאך

The events at Marah in Exod 15:22-26 foreshadow the covenant at Sinai in miniature, containing the benefits, stipulations, curses, and blessings of the later Sinaitic covenant.² The wilderness journey introduces Israel to the basic tenets of their responsibilities to YHWH, as the Israelites freed from Egypt learn to trust YHWH and observe His commandments in the wilderness. As such, the wilderness journeys (Exod 16-18) are an important link between Egypt (Exod 1-15) and Sinai (Exod 19-40), preparing Israel for the reception of the law and covenant at Sinai.³

¹ Houtman, *Exodus II*, 301-315.

² Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 581.

³ Rainer Albertz, "Wilderness Material in Exodus (Exodus 15-18)," in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (eds. Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr; VTSup 164; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 153.

6.2 Exodus 16 and the Holiness Composition

Within the wilderness journeys, Exodus 16* is the first text considered to contain Priestly material.⁴ Scholars are divided over how to identify the Priestly material in the chapter, especially whether it originally included the Sabbath material at the end of the chapter.⁵ There are however no literary-critical grounds for removing the Sabbath texts at the end of the chapter as secondary, and in that regards I will follow the influential assessment by Eberhard Ruprecht, according to whom Exod 16:1-3, 6-7, 9-27, 30, 35a is a unified Priestly narrative, to which later Deuteronomistic materials have been added in 16:4-5, 28-29, 31-32. Ruprecht's analysis is followed by Crüsemann, Blum, Köckert, Albertz, Rose, Fritz, and Scharf among others.⁶

6.2.1 The Function of the Priestly Manna-Sabbath Narrative Exodus 16

The Priestly Manna-Sabbath narrative in Exod 16:1-3, 6-7, 9-27, 30, 35a is not out of place preceding the Sinai narrative as sometimes is argued, but rather the chapter develops several important themes for the Priestly narrative and connects the Exodus with the revelation at Sinai.⁷ The first part of the chapter (vv.1-3, 6-7, 9-11) in-

⁴ Though Otto and Pola exclude Exod 16* from the Priestly narrative due to its connection with supposedly later Priestly elements. Otto removes the text due to its connection with Exod 6:6-8, which he considers a later Priestly text ("Forschungen," 40), and Pola removes the text due to the supposedly later occurrence of *עדה* for the community of Israel (*Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 134ff). Joel Baden argues that Exod 16 originally appeared later in the Priestly narrative near Num 15:32-36 ("The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16," *ZAW* 122 (2010): 491-504), but this view is ungrounded (Albertz, "Wilderness Material in Exodus [Exodus 15-18]," 156).

⁵ E.g. Weimar, who removes all references to the Sabbath as secondary (*Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 41, 65, 80-81, 327-39).

⁶ Eberhard Ruprecht, "Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Mannawunder (Exod 16) im Aufbau der Priesterschrift," *ZAW* 86 (1974): 269-307; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 146-48; Aaron Scharf, *Mose und Israel im Konflikt: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche studie zu den Wüstenerzählungen* (OBO 98; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1990), 132, 181-83; Albertz, "Wilderness Material in Exodus (Exodus 15-18)," 156; *Exodus 1-18*, 161-64; Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 97n101; Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 299; Volkmar Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt: Studien zum Tempelbau in Israel und zu dem Zeltheiligtum der Priesterschrift* (WMANT 47; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1977), 2n10; Martin Rose, *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke* (ATHANT 67; Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981), 51.

⁷ Ruprecht, "Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Mannawunder," 270-71.

roduces the theme of the כבוד יהוה. The Israelites have travelled to the wilderness of Sin, where they complain against Moses and Aaron due to a lack of food (vv.1-2) and long to return to Egypt where they had food, regretting that Moses and Aaron have brought them out of Egypt (v.3). Moses and Aaron respond (v.6b-7a):

ערב וידעתם כי יהוה הוציא אתכם מארץ מצרים
ובקר וראיתם את־כבוד יהוה משמעו את־תלנתיכם על יהוה

Thus a point of contest between the Israelites and Moses and Aaron is over who has brought them out of Egypt.⁸ The ensuing narrative should be seen as part of the process of Israel coming to the realization that YHWH has brought them out of Egypt, and what this means for them. The כבוד יהוה then appears in a cloud and speaks to Moses (v.12):

שמעתי את־תלונת בני ישראל דבר אלהם לאמר
בין הערבים תאכלו בשר ובבקר תשבועו־לחם
וידעתם כי אני יהוה אלהיכם

The text is linked to the Sea Miracle account in Exod 14:4, 18, where the כבוד יהוה is also associated with knowledge of YHWH:

Exod 14:4, 18

וחזקתי את־לב־פרעה ורדף אחריהם
ואכבדה בפרעה ובכל־חילו
וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה
וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה בהכבדי בפרעה

Exod 16:6-7, 12

ערב וידעתם כי יהוה הוציא אתכם
מארץ מצרים
ובקר וראיתם את־כבוד יהוה
וידעתם כי אני יהוה אלהיכם

Whereas the goal of the Sea Miracle was to bring YHWH glory and lead to His recognition by the Egyptians, in the narrative of Exod 16 the glory of YHWH becomes a sign of divine accompaniment and provision, leading to knowledge of YHWH's character in his provision for the Israelites.⁹ The provision in the wilderness is thus part of the promise of Exod 6:7 that Israel will come to know YHWH.¹⁰ The appearance of

⁸ L. Schmidt, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 40.

⁹ Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 157-58.

¹⁰ Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 134.

the glory also points to how YHWH responds to the complaints of the Israelites by providing manna and quail for them (vv.14-15). As Albertz notes however, the purpose of the narrative is not simply to describe YHWH's provision for Israel, but to introduce the Sabbath to the Israelites, which has been hidden from them since creation.¹¹ The appearance of the manna and quail facilitate the possibility for Israel to learn to trust in YHWH. The Israelites are to gather a portion of food for one day only, and are not to hoard food for the next day, since it would spoil (vv.16-21). On the sixth day, the Israelites are to gather a double portion that will last for the seventh day as well, as there were to be no provisions on the seventh day (v.22). As argued by Albertz, the details of the narrative with the temporal limitation and daily provision of the manna are delineated for the purpose of teaching Israel about the Sabbath.¹² The Sabbath is thus not a secondary concern of the narrative, but rather the narrative is designed for the purpose of Israel learning about the Sabbath. It is what Achenbach describes as a "Lehrerzählung" which teaches observance to the Sabbath Torah.¹³ The vivid descriptions form a compelling memory for later generations to reinforce Israel's responsibility for Sabbath observance and trust in YHWH's provision.¹⁴ Since the establishment of the Sabbath at the creation of the world (Gen 2:1-4a), Israel does not yet know what the Sabbath is. Prior to the revelation of the law of the Sabbath at Sinai in Exod 20:8-11, Israel must have a concept of what the Sabbath is, and therefore the revelation of the Sabbath in Exod 16 is of vital importance for the Priestly

¹¹ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 273.

¹² Ibid., 273-74.

¹³ Achenbach, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen," 161n40.

¹⁴ Barat Ellman, *Memory and Covenant: The Role of Israel's and God's Memory in Sustaining the Deuteronomic and Priestly Covenants* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013), 141-42.

narrative.¹⁵ The experiences in the wilderness provide an opportunity for Moses to teach Israel about the Sabbath in vv.23-30:

שבתון שבת־קדש ליהוה מחר את אשר־תאפו אפו ואת אשר־תבשלו בשלו
ואת כל־העדף הניחו לכם למשמרת עד־הבקר
ויניחו אתו עד־הבקר כאשר צוה משה ולא הבאיש ורמה לא־היתה בו
ויאמר משה אכלהו היום כי־שבת היום ליהוה היום לא תמצאהו בשדה
ששת ימים תלקטהו וביום השביעי שבת לא יהיה־בו
ויהי ביום השביעי יצאו מן־העם ללקט ולא מצאו
ויאמר יהוה אל־משה עד־אנה מאנתם לשמר מצותי ותורתי
ראו כי־יהוה נתן לכם השבת על־כן הוא נתן לכם ביום הששי לחם יומים
שבו איש תחתיו אל־יצא איש ממקמו ביום השביעי
וישבתו העם ביום השביעי

The references to the Sabbath are not anachronistic, but rather a foreshadowing of the institution of the Sabbath at Sinai.¹⁶ The revelation of the Sabbath is an important part of the restoration of creation that is a *Leitmotif* in the Priestly narrative.¹⁷ The instructions point forward to the Decalogue Sabbath laws (Exod 20:8-11) and the Sabbath laws surrounding the Tabernacle instructions in Exod 31:12-17; 35:2-3:¹⁸

Exod 16:23-30	Exod 20:8-11	Exod 31:13-17; 35:2-3
23 שבתון שבת־קדש ליהוה	8 וזכור את־יום השבת לקדשו	13 את־שבתתי תשמרו כי אות הוא ביני וביניכם לדרתיכם לדעת כי אני יהוה מקדשכם
25 שבת היום ליהוה		14 ושמרתם את־השבת כי קדש הוא לכם ששת ימים יעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה
26 ששת ימים תלקטהו וביום השביעי שבת	9 ששת ימים תעבד ועשית כל־מלאכתך 10 ויום השביעי שבת ליהוה	15 כ־העשה מלאכה ביום השבת מות יומת ושמרו בני־ישראל את־השבת לעשות את־השבת לדרתם ברית עולם 17 ביני ובין בני ישראל אות הוא לעולם כי־ששת ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ וביום השביעי שבת וינפש
30 וישבתו העם ביום השביעי	11 כי ששת־ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ את־הים ואת־כל־אשר־בם וינח ביום השביעי על־כן ברך יהוה את־יום השבת ויקדשהו	

¹⁵ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 385.

¹⁶ Propp, *Exodus 1-18*, 590.

¹⁷ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 312; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 385.

¹⁸ Ibid., 386.

The theme of the sanctity (קדש) of the Sabbath connects these verses to the inauguration of the Sabbath in Gen 2:1-4a, and presents a developing sequence of the revelation of the Sabbath to Israel.¹⁹ Exodus 16 foreshadows the Tabernacle in Exod 25-40 in introducing the כבוד יהוה for the first time, which will take residence in the Tabernacle (Exod 24:15b-18a; 29:42-46; 40:34-35), as well as introducing the Sabbath, which will become a sign of the Sinai covenant and YHWH's sanctifying presence among Israel (Exod 31:13-17). Each of these concepts is also connected with the motif of the recognition of YHWH:

Exod 16:6	ערב וידעתם כי יהוה הוציא אתכם מארץ מצרים
Exod 16:12	בבקר תשבעו-לחם וידעתם כי אני יהוה אלהיכם
Exod 29:46	וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים לשכני בתוכם אני יהוה אלהיהם
Exod 31:13	את-שבתתי תשמרו כי אות הוא ביני וביניכם לדרתיכם לדעת כי אני יהוה מקדשכם

Exodus 16 is thus an important link in the Priestly narrative between the Exodus, the revelation of the Sabbath, and the indwelling of the כבוד יהוה among Israel in the Tabernacle as part of the developing recognition of YHWH.²⁰

6.2.2 The Function of Exodus 16 as Part of the Holiness Composition

Scholars have long noted the affinities between the Priestly portions of Exodus 16 and the Holiness Code. The terminology for the Sabbath coincides with Sabbath terminology in the Holiness Code, which has led several scholars to attribute the Sabbath texts in Exod 16 to H.²¹ Particularly 16:23 defines the Sabbath in terms peculiar

¹⁹ Ibid., 385; Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 47.

²⁰ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 384-86.

²¹ Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 17; Cooper and Goldstein, "The Development of Priestly Calendars," 16-18; Milgrom, "HR in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 37-39; Achenbach, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen," 161n40; Dillmann, *Exodus and Leviticus*, 190.

to the Holiness Code: שבתון שבת־קדש ליהוה. Associating the Sabbath with holiness (קדש) is considered a special concern of the Holiness Code, as well as the use of the term שבתון:

Exod 16:23-30	Exod 31:13-17; 35:2-3	Holiness Code texts
23 <u>שבתון שבת־קדש ליהוה</u>	13 את־שבתתי תשמרו כי אות הוא ביני וביניכם לדרתיכם לדעת כי אני יהוה <u>מקדשכם</u>	Lev 16:31 ²² שבת שבתון היא לכם
25 <u>שבת היום ליהוה</u>	14 ושמרתם את־השבת כי <u>קדש</u> הוא לכם	Lev 23:3 <u>ששת ימים תעשה</u> מלאכה <u>וביום השביעי שבת</u> <u>שבתון מקרא־קדש</u>
26 <u>ששת ימים תלקטו</u> <u>וביום השביעי שבת</u>	15 <u>ששת ימים יעשה מלאכה</u> <u>וביום השביעי שבת שבתון</u> <u>קדש ליהוה</u> כל־העשה מלאכה ביום השבת מות יומת ושמרו בני־ישראל את־השבת לעשות את־השבת לדרתם ברית עולם ביני ובין בני ישראל אות הוא לעולם כ־ששת ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ וביום השביעי שבת וינפש ששת ימים תעשה מלאכה 35:2 <u>וביום השביעי יהיה לכם קדש</u> <u>שבת שבתון ליהוה</u>	Lev 23:32 שבת שבתון ועניתם את־נפשותיכם בתשעה לחדש בערב מערב עד־ערב תשבתו שבתכם
30 וישבתו העם <u>ביום השביעי</u>	16 ושמרו בני־ישראל את־השבת לעשות את־השבת לדרתם ברית עולם ביני ובין בני ישראל אות הוא לעולם כ־ששת ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ וביום השביעי שבת וינפש ששת ימים תעשה מלאכה 35:2 <u>וביום השביעי יהיה לכם קדש</u> <u>שבת שבתון ליהוה</u>	Lev 25:4 ובשנה השביעת שבת שבתון יהיה לארץ <u>שבת ליהוה</u>

Also the recognition statements in Exod 16:6, 11 are a feature of the style of the Holiness Code. Not only are there linguistic ties between the Priestly narrative in Exod 16 and the Holiness Code, but conceptually Exod 16 is important for establishing the philosophical and theological foundations for the laws of the Holiness Code. This takes place as part of the developing revelation of the Sabbath that begins as a foundational theme of the Holiness Composition in Gen 1:1–2:4a and continues through the Tabernacle texts in Exod 31:13-17; 35:1-3 as a sign of the sanctification of Israel, and becomes central to the theology of the Holiness Code in Lev 17-26. Israel experiences the provision of YHWH on the Sabbath, and learns to trust that if they observe the

²² On Lev 16:29-34 as an H text that aligns the Priestly Day of Atonement in Lev 16:1-28, see Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 27-29 and Milgrom, *Leviticus 1-16*, 39-40.

Sabbath, YHWH will provide for their needs, which is why Achenbach describes the narrative as a "Lehrerzählung" that teaches observance to Sabbath Torah.²³ This experience prepares Israel to observe the laws of the Holiness Code. Particularly Exod 16 can be read as an object lesson for the laws of the Sabbath of the land in Lev 25. Lev 25:2, 4 takes up the concept of the *שבת ליהוה* from Exod 16:23, 25 to describe the Sabbath year for fallowing the land.²⁴ Leviticus 25:1-20 teaches Israel the law of the Sabbath year (25:1-7) as well as the Jubilee Sabbath year every fifty years (25:9-12). The Israelites are to farm their lands and vineyards for six years, but the seventh year is to be a *שבת שבתון* for the land, that is a *שבת ליהוה* (Lev 25:4) in which Israel refrains from work and must trust YHWH for provision. This is the same situation Israel faces in the wilderness in Exodus 16: they are to gather food for six days, and on the seventh day they are to rest and trust YHWH's provision on the *שבת ליהוה*.²⁵ The Priestly narrative in Exod 16 can be appropriately considered a didactic narrative which undergirds the Torah instruction of Lev 25 and inculcates trust in YHWH's provision for the seventh year, functioning like Gen 1:1–2:4a does in establishing the foundations for and motivating obedience to the Sabbath laws and festival calendar in Lev 23. Within the section of Exod 15:22-18:27, which introduces Israel to the concept of divine instruction, the Holiness Code account of Exod 16 elevates the Sabbath to primary importance as Torah of YHWH in the wilderness. Exodus 16 can thus be seen as an integral part of the developing Holiness composition through the book of Exodus, connecting the salvation from Egypt with the revelation of the law and Tabernacle at Sinai.

²³ Achenbach, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen," 161n40.

²⁴ Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 319, 334; Achenbach, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen," 161n40.

²⁵ Grünwaldt, *Heiligkeitgesetz*, 334.

6.3 The Holiness Composition and the Sinai Texts Exodus 19-40

The Sinai Covenant and Tabernacle texts in Exodus 19-40 can be divided into two parts. First, Exod 19-24 recounts Israel's arrival at Mount Sinai (Ch 19), their reception of the laws of the Decalogue and Book of the Covenant (Exod 20-23), and the concluding covenant ceremony (Exod 24). Each of these chapters contains multiple layers of material that is difficult to assign to particular layers with certainty, but there is general agreement that there is very little material from the Priestly base layer in chapters 19-24. In chapter 19, generally only the itinerary notices in 19:1-2* are considered Priestly. Exodus 19:1-2* and 24:15b-18a form a Priestly frame around the non-Priestly Sinai texts in Exod 19-24:14, which find their continuation in Exod 32-34.²⁶ The itinerary in 19:1-2* which recounts the arrival at Sinai is universally considered Priestly, and with the Decalogue in Exod 20 there is a growing consensus of assigning vv.8-11, which describe the Sabbath, to a Priestly redaction.²⁷ Comparisons with the Decalogue in Deut 5:6-21 indicate that the main difference between the Decalogues is the rationale for the Sabbath.²⁸ Whereas in Deut 5:12-15 the rationale for Sabbath observance is remembrance of Egyptian slavery, in Exod 20:8-11 the command reflects the motifs of the Priestly creation account:

²⁶ Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1395; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 145; Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 121-22.

²⁷ Dozeman, *Exodus*, 471. A few scholars maintain that the entire Decalogue of 20:1-17 belongs to a pre-Priestly Elohist (Stackert, "Compositional Strata," 13-14; Joel Baden, *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch* [FAT 68; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009], 153-61).

²⁸ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40* [HThKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2004], 93. The relationship between the Decalogues in Exod 20 and Deut 5 has been debated extensively. Dohmen (*Exodus 19-40*, 91-93) and F.-L. Hossfeld (*Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen* [OBO 45; Fribourg&Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1982]) represent the view that Exod 20 is later than Deut 5, whereas Kilchör represents a recent example of taking Deut 5 as an interpretation of Exod 20 (*Jahwetora und Mosetora*, 43-51).

8	<u>זכור²⁹ את־יום השבת לקדשו</u>	12	<u>שמור את־יום השבת לקדשו</u>
			כאשר צוה יהוה אלהיך
9	<u>ששת ימים תעבד ועשית כל־מלאכתך</u>	13	<u>ששת ימים תעבד ועשית כל־מלאכתך</u>
10	<u>ויום השביעי שבת ליהוה אלהיך</u>	14	<u>ויום השביעי שבת ליהוה אלהיך</u>
	<u>לא־תעשה כל־מלאכה אתה ובנך־ובתך</u>		<u>לא תעשה כל־מלאכה אתה ובנך־ובתך</u>
	<u>עבדך ואמתך ובהמתך</u>		<u>ועבדך־ואמתך ושורך וחמרך וכל־בהמתך</u>
	<u>וגרך אשר בשעריך</u>		<u>וגרך אשר בשעריך</u>
			למען ינוח עבדך ואמתך כמוך
11	כי ששת־ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ את־הים ואת־כל־אשר־בם וינח ביום השביעי על־כן ברח יהוה את־יום השבת ויקדשהו	15	זכרת כי־עבד היית בארץ מצרים ויצאך יהוה אלהיך משם ביד חזקה ובזרע נטויה על־כן צוה יהוה אלהיך לעשות את־יום השבת

The most widely accepted and plausible explanation of this phenomenon is that both forms have expanded an original Sabbath command with rationales, with a redaction in Exod 20:8-11 relating the Decalogue to the Priestly creation account.³⁰ Following the line of argument developed here, if the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:4a is a Holiness Composition, Exod 20:8-11 would likely come from the Holiness school as well.³¹

The second part of Exod 19-40 is the Tabernacle account in 24:15b-40:38, which is considered Priestly, with the exception of the intervening non-Priestly golden calf and covenant renewal narrative in Exod 32-34. The Priestly material in Exod 24:15b-40:38* however has undergone a long process of development that continued late into the Hellenistic era, as seen from the variants in the LXX especially of Exod

²⁹ The use of זכור implies that the Sabbath is already known to Israel, and must refer back to its revelation in Exodus 16 (Albertz, *Exodus 19-40* [ZB 2.2; Zürich: Theologische Verlag, 2015], 64).

³⁰ Propp, *Exodus 19-40* (AB 2B; New York: Doubleday, 2006), 146, and Childs, *Exodus*, 391-92, 415-416; Erhard Blum, "The Decalogue and the Composition History of the Pentateuch," in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research* (eds. Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz; FAT 78; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 289-301; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 488-92; Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 29-30, 63-65;

³¹ Milgrom, "Hr in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 38-39. Knohl assigns 20:11 to the Holiness Code, and maintains 20:8-10 in his PT (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 67), due to his adherence to the idea of the PT assignment of Gen 1:1–2:4a, which Milgrom rejects in his later work, assigning it to Hr. Against separating 20:11 from vv.8-10, Childs has argued that the whole unit is a "carefully constructed unit which reveals a clear structure" that should not be taken apart (*Exodus*, 415).

35-40.³² Exodus 25-40 consists in instructions for preparing and building the Tabernacle and a corresponding execution report, with a few prominent texts containing narratives and speeches that express the theology and function of the Tabernacle. The Tabernacle instructions themselves exhibit a variety of traditions which have been combined and gradually developed to include later cultic innovations, as seen from the diverse terminology used for the Tabernacle itself, as well as its appurtenances. Most scholars attempt to isolate an earliest Priestly narrative that connects with the Priestly narratives in Genesis-Exodus, which either has assimilated older traditions, or to which later accumulations have been added. The following chart illustrates the proposals of various scholars for the base Priestly narrative in the Tabernacle account:

Extent of Priestly Narrative in the Sinai Pericope:

Eckart Otto ³³	Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:8ff.; 26:1-27:19*; 28:1-29:46*.
Thomas Pola ³⁴	Exod 19:1; 25:1, 8a, 9; 29:45-46; 40:16, 17a, 33b.
Peter Weimar ³⁵	Exod 19:1; 24:15b,16, 18a; 25:1a, 2aα, 8, 9; 26:1*, 2a, 6*, 7, 8a, 11a*, 15a, 16, 18*, 20*, 22*, 23a, 30; 29:45-46; 39:32b, 43; 40:17, 34.
Christian Frevel ³⁶	Exod 19,1.2a*; 24,15b-16.[17].18aα; 25,1.2aα; 25,8f; 26.1-19*29; 26,30; 29,43. 44a*.45f; 35,1a.4b; 39,32.43; 40,17.33b.34f..
Christophe Nihan ³⁷	Exod 25-29*; 39:32, 42-43; 40:17, 34-35.
Bernd Janowski ³⁸	Exod 19:1; 24:15b-18aα; 25:1ff., 8-9*; 26:1-27:8*; 29:43-46*; 39:32b, 43; 40:17, 34-35.
Martin Noth ³⁹	Exod 19:1, 2a; 24:15b-18; 25:1-40; 26:1-37; 27:1-21; 28:1-43; 29:1-46; 31:18; 39:32, (42?), 43; 40:17.

³² Natalio Fernandez Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. Wilfred Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 99-100; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 32n68; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 595-96; Houtman, *Exodus III*, 314-15.

³³ Otto, "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 26-27.

³⁴ Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 298.

³⁵ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 22n18.

³⁶ Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 145.

³⁷ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 57-58.

³⁸ Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 48-50, following G. Steins, "Sie sollen mir ein Heiligtum machen: Zur Struktur und Entstehung von Exod 24:12-31:18," in *Vom Sinai zum Horeb: Stationen alttestamentlicher Glaubengeschichte* (ed. F.-L. Hossfeld; Würzburg: Echter, 1989), 145-167.

³⁹ Noth originally maintained Exod 35:1a,4b, 5-10, 20-27, 29-31a, 32, 33; 36:2-7; 37:1-24; 38:1-7, 9-22, 24-31; 39:1-32, 43; 40:1, 2, 9, 17-25, 28, 29a, 33, as an execution report to the Tabernacle construction (*A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*, 17-19). In his *Exodus* commentary he took the

Norbert Lohfink ⁴⁰	Exod 19:1, 2a; 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8, 9*; 26:1-30; 29:43-46; 31:18; 34:29-32; 35:4, 5a, 10, 20-22a, 29; 36:2-3a, 8*; 39:32-33a, 42-43; 40:17, 33b-35.
Karl Elliger ⁴¹	Exod 19:1, 2a; 24:15b-18a; 25:1-40; 26:1-37; 27:1-19; 28:1-41; 29:1-37...42b-46; 31:18; 35:1a, 4b-10, 20-29; 36:2; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34.
Volkmar Fritz ⁴²	Exod 25:1, 10-14, 16-18, 21a, 22a, 23-26, 28, 30; 26:7, 9-11, 14, 31, 33a, 35a, 36, 37; 27:1, 2, 4, 5a, 6-28*; 40:16-17a, 33b
Susanne Owczarek ⁴³	Exod 19:1ff.; 24:15b, 16, 18a; 25:1-2aa, 8-9aaßb; 26:7-11, 15-17, 18b-29, 36ff.; 27:1-8a; 28:2, 6-8, 15ff., 22-28, 31-34, 39; 29:5-7, 29ff., 35a, 44-46; 39:32b, 43; 40:17, 34ff..
Klaus Koch ⁴⁴	Exod 25-31*; 34:29-35; 35:20-29; 36:2-7; 39:32b (42ff); 40:1-16 (17), 33b, 34ff..
Georg Steins ⁴⁵	Exod 25:1, 8-9; 26:1-27:8*; 29:43-44a, 45-46.

As seen from this chart, there is general agreement that at least Exod 19:1-2*; 24:15-18*; 25:1, 8-9*; 29:43-46; 40:17, 34 are part of the base Priestly narrative. The main differences in these assessments relate to whether material within Exod 25-29* is considered to be an integral part of the Priestly narrative, or to contain traditions utilized by the Priestly narrative, or are later additions. The second main difference is the extent to which material from the execution report of Exod 35-40 is considered to belong to the original Priestly narrative. On this point there is a developing consensus represented by Pola, Weimar, Frevel, Janowski, and Nihan among others, that only minimal portions of Exod 39-40 form the conclusion of the Priestly narrative.

limited view of the execution reports maintained here (*Exodus*, 274-75, 280, 282).

⁴⁰ Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," 145n29.

⁴¹ Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 121-22.

⁴² Fritz, *Tempel und Zelt*, 112-22, containing a tent sanctuary with the ark, table, and altar, that is only concerned with the indwelling of YHWH among Israel (*Tempel und Zelt*, 147-49).

⁴³ Susanne Owczarek, *Die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes inmitten seines Volkes in der Priesterschrift* (Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998), 319.

⁴⁴ Koch, *Die Priesterschrift von Ex 25 bis Lev 16: Eine Überlieferungsgeschichtliche und literarkritische Untersuchung* [FRLANT 71; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1959], 98. Koch considers 25:10-31, 37ff; 26:7-15, 25ff., 29-37; 27:1-8 (9); 28:1-29:35; 30:16-21; 40:1-15 to be ritual *Vorlagen* (*Die Priesterschrift*, 97).

⁴⁵ Steins, "Sie sollen mir ein Heiligtum machen," 166.

Due to the difficulty of source-critical investigations of the Priestly Sinai pericope, Helmut Utzschneider most recently, and other scholars before him have pursued a tradition-historical approach to understanding the material underlying the final form of Exod 25-40. According to Utzschneider, the Tabernacle texts of Exod 25-40 contain three types of material: Exod 25:16, 21-22 represents an "ark-dwelling" conception in which Moses is presented in a prophetic office, Exodus 25:2, 8 represents a "people-sanctuary" conception, and Exod 29:43-46 a "tent of meeting" conception.⁴⁶ These traditions were added onto each other successively, until they were integrated into the Priestly narrative continuing from Gen-Exod.⁴⁷ Earlier studies by Klaus Koch among others argued for a collection of oral traditions underlying the different Tabernacle traditions.⁴⁸ Most scholars today consider that Exod 25-29 has combined three different conceptions of the Tabernacle, with varying degrees of confidence in the ability to reconstruct these traditions:⁴⁹ 1) a Tent of Meeting tradition with a focus on Moses in a prophetic office and "meeting" (יָעַד) with YHWH; 2) a "heavenly tabernacle" tradition that is similar to ancient Near Eastern traditions of a heavenly sanctuary,

⁴⁶ Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 209.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 230, 252-53.

⁴⁸ Koch, *Die Priesterschrift*, 98-97; Also Childs (*Exodus*, 530-32), Nihan (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 47-48), and Blum (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 308n80) discuss the possibility of oral traditions. Against Koch it can be noted that Exod 25-40 does not express repeated ritual prescriptions, but rather the one-time establishment of the sanctuary (Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 301n52).

⁴⁹ Childs, *Exodus*, 533-535. For example, Albertz considers all of these traditions as part of his PB1 (Priestly narrative), but says that PB1 has utilized various *Vorlagen* (*Exodus 1-18*, 12-13). R. Schmitt (*Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft* [Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlag, 1972], 225-228) and Janowski (*Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 295-346) both argue that the final Priestly form of the Tabernacle account is essentially unified, but nevertheless speak of traditions utilized by the Priestly Tabernacle account. According to Otto, P has combined and mediated two different sanctuary traditions ("Forschungen," 26), and according to Weimar, P has combined two conceptions, one focused on "Wohnen" associated with the lexemes מִשְׁכָּן, שֹׁכֵן, and the other on "Begegnen," connected with the lexemes יָעַד and אָהֵל מוֹעֵד into a "spannungshafte Einheit" (*Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 279-280). Israel Knohl argues that Exod 25-31 is composed of three scrolls of the Priestly Torah (25:10-27:19; 28:1-29:37; 30:1-38) which have been combined at their "seams" (25:1-9; 27:20-21; 29:38-46) by texts from the Holiness School (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 63-64).

focused on the concept of a תבנית seen by Moses (Exod 25:9, 40).⁵⁰ And 3) the Priestly narrative with its שכן and כבוד theology that links to the earlier Priestly narratives in Exodus. On this point, there is widespread agreement that Exod 19:1-2*; 24:15-18*; 29:43-46; 40:17, 33-34* connect the Priestly Tabernacle account with the Priestly narratives from Genesis and Exodus. As was the case with the analysis of Exodus 1-16, I will not undertake a completely new assessment of the stratification of Exodus 25-40. I will begin my analysis with what is widely accepted as the base layer of the Priestly narrative that runs through Exodus 24-40 at key structuring points of the Tabernacle account, of which there is general agreement. There is also widespread agreement that the earliest Tabernacle account contained only a minimal version of an execution report, preserved in the current account of Exod 35-40. I will address two main points of contention that relate to the analysis of this base narrative: the first question is whether the base Priestly narrative pre-dates or post-dates the various Tabernacle traditions that are connected to it in Exodus 25-31. There are three solutions proposed to this question: either Exod 25-31* represent an integral part of the Priestly narrative, they are traditions taken up and incorporated into the Priestly narrative, or they are later additions. The second contested point I will address is the belonging of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 to the base Priestly narrative. These texts introduce the Sabbath as a sign of Israel's sanctification and bracket the non-Priestly account of Exod 32-34. Though these Sabbath texts are usually excluded from the Priestly narrative as secondary due to their location and language, some scholars have argued that they should be maintained in the Priestly narrative as consistent with its developing

⁵⁰ As noted by Von Rad, the תבנית conception is not mentioned in the execution report, as the term is found only in 25:9, 40. This suggests that it represents an older tradition taken up by the Priestly narrative (*Priesterschrift*, 181). Recently on the independence of the תבנית tradition, see Pola (*Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 242-53) and Weimar (*Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 283n45). According to Houtman, the תבנית is best understood as a "masterplan," and not a heavenly sanctuary (*Exodus 20-40*, 345).

conception of the Sabbath. I will consider linguistic and conceptual reasons for maintaining the Sabbath texts in Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 as part of the base Priestly narrative, as well as comparative ancient Near Eastern evidence which supports the view that the notion of rest is closely associated with Tabernacle building and should therefore be maintained as part of the original Tabernacle account. To anticipate my results, I will conclude that Exod 24:15b-18*; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:13-17; 35:1-3; 40:17, 33-35 form the continuation of the Priestly narratives from Genesis-Exodus and present the completion of the Tabernacle and its indwelling by YHWH as the culmination of the promises from Gen 17; Exod 6:2-8, and also ties to Gen 1:1-2:4a to represent the restoration of creation. These Priestly texts have utilized older Tabernacle traditions in Exod 25-29* to form a coherent narrative of instructions and completion of the Tabernacle, with Exod 29:43-46 a key text that has integrated older traditions. The Sabbath texts in Exod 31:13-17; 35:1-3 form an integral part of this restoration and bracket the Priestly Tabernacle account around the non-Priestly account of the golden calf and covenant renewal in Exod 32-34*. It will be seen also that the function of this base narrative will align with the interests of the Holiness Code.

6.3.1 The Base Priestly Narrative in the Sinai Tabernacle Account

Exodus 24:15b-18*; 25:1-2, 8-9*; 29:45-46; 40:17, 34 are usually seen as part of the Priestly *Grundschrift* in Exod 24-40, and serve as a useful starting point to analyzing the development of the Priestly Tabernacle account and its relationship with the Priestly narratives in Gen-Exod-Lev. The Priestly material beginning with Exod 24:15b-18a is added to pre-Priestly material that is occupied with the themes of

covenant and the Decalogue in Exod 19-34.⁵¹ Exodus 19:3-8 introduces the motif of the covenant, which will be renewed in Exodus 34:10. The covenant is accompanied by the giving of the Decalogue (20:1-23), and the Book of the Covenant (Exod 20:24-23:33) and concluded with a ceremony (Exod 24:1-8). The motif of the Tablets of the covenant link Exod 24:12; 31:18; 34:1-5 to the breaking of the covenant in Exod 32-33, which in turn requires a renewed covenant document (34:6-26) and ceremony (34:27-28), accompanied by the renewal of commitment to the Decalogue (34:28). The Priestly material in Exod 24-40 is thus interwoven with this dense web of pre-Priestly material addressing the central theological themes of the covenant and the Decalogue.⁵²

6.3.2 Exodus 24:15b-18a

Within Exodus 24, the Priestly narrative picks up with the description of the dwelling on Mount Sinai (24:15b-16, 18):⁵³

ויעל משה אל-ההר ויבס הענן את-ההר
וישכן כבוד-יהוה על-ההר סיני ויבסוהו הענן ששת ימים
ויקרא אל-משה ביום השביעי מתוך הענן
ויבא משה בתוך הענן ויעל אל-ההר ויהי משה בהר ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה

Exodus 24 represents the conclusion to the giving of the law at Sinai with the Decalogue and Book of the Covenant (Exod 20-23). The lawgiving concludes with the covenant ceremony in Exod 24:1-8, where Moses and the elders of Israel go up the mountain and have a covenant meal in the presence of YHWH, and the people affirm their commitment to the covenant (vv.7-8). This covenant ceremony invites the presence of YHWH to dwell among the Israelites,⁵⁴ and is part of what Wolfgang Oswald

⁵¹ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 210-211.

⁵² Ibid., 211.

⁵³ Exod 24:17, which provides a description of the glory of YHWH, is sometimes considered a later addition. Against most scholars, Eckart Otto considers Exod 24:15-18 to be a post-Priestly redactional text combining P and D materials ("Nachpriesterschriftliche Exoduserzählung," 80-84).

⁵⁴ Ada Taggar-Cohen, "Violence at the Birth of Religion in Exod 19-40," *JISMOR* 1 (2005):

has called the "Exodus-Mountain of God Narrative"⁵⁵ and Rainer Albertz an "Exoduskomposition" (K^{EX}) which has been extended by a redaction (Deuteronomic for Oswald, R^{EX} for Albertz) to its present form in Exod 19-24.⁵⁶ The Priestly Tabernacle account in Exod 25-40 presupposes this covenant relationship as a prerequisite for YHWH dwelling among Israel.⁵⁷ In the pre-Priestly Sinai narrative, YHWH is present at the sacred mountain of Sinai (19:9-11).⁵⁸ Once the relationship between YHWH and Israel is initiated, the Priestly account introduces the motif of YHWH dwelling among the people beyond Mount Sinai (24:15b-18; 29:43-46). The Priestly account of the indwelling of YHWH amidst Israel represents a further qualification of the non-Priestly account in Exod 19:16-19, where YHWH descends (ירד) on the mountain but does not take residence in the midst of Israel.⁵⁹ The Priestly theophany differs from the pre-Priestly account of violent natural phenomenon of thunder and lightning and thick clouds (קלת וברקים וענן כבד cf. 19:16), with the presence of God being manifested rather in the solemn כבוד יהוה in the midst of the cloud (ענן) covering the mountain (Exod 24:15).⁶⁰ Beginning in Exod 24:12-18, which is a text that integrates the first two blocks of the Sinai pericope (Exod 19-24 and Exod 25-31), as well as points for-

106.

⁵⁵ Oswald, "Die Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung," 35-49.

⁵⁶ Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 10-12. According to Albertz, K^{EX} is a pre-Priestly narrative that has integrated various older traditions, and it has the covenant establishment (Exod 19-24), breaking of the covenant (Exod 32), and covenant renewal (Exod 33-34) as its basic features. John Van Seters considers the material to be from J (*The Life of Moses*, 247-360).

⁵⁷ Based on the position of Exod 24:16-18 having a connecting function between the covenant ceremony in Exod 24 and the Tabernacle texts following, Dohmen affirms that "...alles, was mit dem Heiligtum zu tun hat, im Kern den Bund Israels mit seinem Gott betrifft" (*Exodus 19-40*, 215). Cf. Ziemer, "Schöpfung, Heiligtum, und Sabbat," 39, 55; Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 81. The "situation of complete harmony" established by the covenant in Exod 24:3-8 is what Houtman calls the "basis and condition for the gift of the tablets and the erection of the tent shrine" (Houtman, *Exodus III*, 298).

⁵⁸ Taggar-Cohen, "Violence at the Birth of Religion in Exod 19-40," 106. On the pre-Priestly assignment of Exod 24, see Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 107-108.

⁵⁹ F. Schnutenhaus, "Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament," *ZAW* 36 (1964): 5-6, 12-14; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 590-92;

⁶⁰ Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 152. According to Dozeman, the Priestly Tabernacle mitigates the danger associated with the presence of YHWH in 19:20-25 (*Exodus*, 765).

ward to Exod 32-34, two conceptions of Moses' ascent up the mountain are recounted.⁶¹ In the non-Priestly account, Moses is to ascend the mountain to receive the tablets of stone (24:12, 18b), which connects with the narrative in Exod 31:18-34:35.⁶² The tablets also represent the presence of God that was experienced by the representatives of Israel in Exod 24, but which can be available to future generations through God's presence in the written words of the tablets.⁶³ In the Priestly narrative on the other hand Moses ascends the mountain to receive the tablets with information for constructing the Tabernacle, leading to the indwelling of the *כבוד יהוה* among Israel.⁶⁴ Exodus 24:15b-18 ties the Priestly narrative to the wilderness itineraries and movement of the *כבוד יהוה* initiated in Exod 16, as well as prepares for the indwelling of the Tabernacle by the *כבוד יהוה* that is introduced in Exod 25:8 and 29:43-46 with *שכן*,⁶⁵ and which will mark the completion of the construction of the Tabernacle in Exodus 40:17, 34.⁶⁶ The *כבוד יהוה* dwells in a cloud on Sinai for six days, after which Moses is called into the cloud on the seventh day. The scheme of six days followed by a seventh day with special significance links the Sinai revelation to Israel's discovery of the seventh day as the special Sabbath in Exod 16, as well as to the creation of the world.⁶⁷ The indwelling of YHWH among the Israelites is thus presented as the original intention of God from the creation of the world, and initiates the

⁶¹ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 206-207.

⁶² Houtman, *Exodus III*, 298. As noted by Dohmen, the motif of the Tablets connects diverse material within the Sinai pericope, combining the concepts of covenant (Exod 19:3-8; 34:6-26), covenant ceremony (Exod 24:1-8; 34:27-28), and Decalogue (Exod 20:1-17; 34:27-28) which bind together the text-complex of Exod 19-34 (*Exodus 19-40*, 210-211).

⁶³ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 214.

⁶⁴ Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 151; Houtman, *Exodus III*, 298. Here Albertz notes that the Priestly account is best understood as a redaction of the pre-Priestly account (*Exodus 19-40*, 152).

⁶⁵ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 208.

⁶⁶ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 58, 66, 292-93; Dozeman, *Exodus*, 590.

⁶⁷ Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord," 506; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 157; Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 171-72. The chronology initiated in Exod 24:15a-18 likewise points to the renewal of the covenant in Exod 32-34 as falling on the Sabbath day (Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 215).

process of the transformation of the world into the realm of the presence of God through His indwelling in the Tabernacle.⁶⁸ For this reason Exod 24:15b-18a and the texts that further explicate this scheme in 25:8; 29:42-46; and 40:17, 34 are a sequence of texts that develop the theme of the indwelling **כבוד יהוה** and cannot be separated without disturbing the coherency of the sequence.

6.3.3 Exodus 25:1-2, 8; 29:45-46

Exod 25:1-2a, 8 is the next text portion that is considered by most scholars to belong to the base Priestly narrative. It provides the first interpretive statement that elucidates the purpose of the sanctuary from the Priestly perspective. Following instructions for Moses to command the people to take up a collection of precious materials from which to build the sanctuary (25:2b-7), the people are to build a sanctuary for YHWH to dwell among them: **ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם**.⁶⁹ Exodus 25:9-40 are then part of the **תבנית** tradition that has been added to the Priestly material or utilized by it. The terms **שכן** and **קדש** link and bracket the Tabernacle traditions between Exod 25:8-29:43-46.⁷⁰ The emphasis in 25:8 is not on YHWH's desire to dwell in a sanctuary, but rather for Him to dwell among the people. The sanctuary is thus only of ancillary significance in that it enables YHWH's dwelling among the people, which emphasis is also seen in the fact that it is the people (**ועשו**) who are commissioned to build the sanctuary. The emphasis on the people of Israel as the addressed participants

⁶⁸ Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 238-244; Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 172; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 64-65.

⁶⁹ On Exod 25:8 as part of the Priestly base narrative connected with Exod 24:15b-18; 29:45-46; 40:17, 34, see Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 325; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 34. The intervening vv.2b-7 are widely considered secondary, due to the connection with the **תרומה** that is a late addition in the execution report in Exod 35 (Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 261; Otto, "Forschungen," 27; Owczarek, *Die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes*, 55; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 165-66).

⁷⁰ Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 324; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 104n103.

in the building of the sanctuary coincides with what Utzschneider has called the "people-sanctuary" Tabernacle traditions that describe the sanctuary as being built by the people of Israel, as opposed to the "tent of meeting" and the "ark-dwelling" conceptions which do not address the people.⁷¹ The differences in the traditions that have been combined in Exod 25-40 are seen most clearly in a comparison of Exod 25:21-22, which addresses Moses, with Exod 25:8; 29:43-46, which are addressed to the Israelites:

25:21-22	ונתת את־הכפרת על־הארץ מלמעלה ואל־הארץ תתן את־העדת אשר אתן אליך
25:8	ועשו לי מקדש ושכנתי בתוכם
29:45-46	ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל והייתי להם לאלהים
	וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים לשכני בתוכם
	אני יהוה אלהיהם

Exodus 25:21-22 reflects a notion of YHWH encountering or meeting (יעד) with Moses in the tent of meeting, whereas Exod 25:8; 29:45-46 describe the presence of God expressed in terms of a dwelling (שכן) among the Israelites.⁷² Though in the final form of Exodus 25-40 the יעד and שכן theologies have been integrated, most scholars since Gerhard von Rad have agreed that these two conceptions reflect different theological traditions that have been combined in Exod 29:43-46.⁷³ The term מקדש used for the sanctuary occurs only in Exod 25:8 in the Priestly narrative, though it is fre-

⁷¹ Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 209. Utzschneider's analysis of Exod 25-40 thus seeks to identify the different traditions that have been combined in the text based on the addressees and the descriptions of the Tabernacle and its appurtenances.

⁷² In addition to Utzschneider, several scholars see here the presence of traditions with different emphasis. According to Otto, "Das Offenbarungskonzept von Exod 25:22 differiert mit dem in Exod 29:42-46" ("Forschungen," 27). According to Knohl, the conception with the עדת and יעד represents the theology of the Priestly Torah with an encounter with an impersonal God and a unilateral pact, as opposed to the more personal שכן theology of indwelling in the Holiness Code (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 145-158, 171).

⁷³ For a discussion, see Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 47-48. So Pola uses the different conceptions as a basis for literary criticism (*Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 230-256). Also both Janowski, (*Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 295-346) and Schmitt (*Zelt*, 225-28) recognize the distinctive traditions of שכן and יעד, though they contend that these conceptions are not in tension.

quent in the Holiness Code and later Priestly texts.⁷⁴ מקדש stands out against the terms אהל מועד and משכן that are otherwise found throughout Exod 25-40. In this regard Görg has proposed that מקדש is an intentionally neutral expression that encapsulates the sanctuary to its full extent with all its accessories, whereas אהל מועד and משכן are limited to the sacred dwelling.⁷⁵ According to Weimar and Frevel, מקדש also utilizes the root קדש in order to connect the building of the sanctuary with the sanctification of the world in Gen 2:2-3.⁷⁶

Exodus 29:42-46 contains the key interpretive statement about the function and significance of the dwelling of the יהוה כבוד in the Priestly Tabernacle:

עלת תמיד לדתיתכם פתח אהל־מועד לפני יהוה אשר אועד לכם שמה לדבר אליך שם
ונעדתי שמה לבני ישראל ונקדש בכבדי
וקדשתי את־אהל מועד ואת־המזבח ואת־אהרן ואת־בניו אקדש לכהן לי
ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל והייתי להם לאלהים
וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים לשכני בתוכם
אני יהוה אלהיהם

Exodus 29:42-46 provides the framework that gives the entire Sinai pericope an interpretation from the context of the Priestly narrative.⁷⁷ Exod 29:45-46 furthers the concept of the restoration of creation initiated in the dating scheme focused on the seventh day as initiated in the revelation of the יהוה כבוד in Exod 24:15b-18 by culminating the progressive realization of the presence of God developed through the Priestly texts of Gen 1:1–2:4a; Gen 17; Exod 6:2-8, and finally pointing to Exod

⁷⁴ Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 306n172. According to Wellhausen, the מקדש represents a more undetermined and lax conception of the Tabernacle that is found frequently in the Holiness Code, whereas the later Q conception of אהל מועד represents a later, more refined conception (*Die Composition des Hexateuchs*, 157).

⁷⁵ Manfred Görg, *Das Zelt der Begegnung: Untersuchung zur Gestalt der sakralen Zeltraditionen Altisraels* (BBB 27; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1967), 35. According to Hundley ("Sacred Spaces, Objects, Offerings, and People in the Priestly Texts: A Reappraisal," *JBL* 132.4 [2013]: 754) and Milgrom (*Leviticus 1-16*, 754-55), מקדש refers to the "entire divine compound."

⁷⁶ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 287; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 104n103.

⁷⁷ Ska, *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*, 122-23.

29:43-46.⁷⁸ The statement in vv.45-46 fulfills many of the central themes of the Priestly narrative: ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל והייתי להם לאלהים וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם אשר
 והוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים לשכני בתוכם אני יהוה אלהיהם. The statement culminates the promise of God dwelling in the midst of the people of Israel from Exod 25:8, and further fulfills the promise of YHWH being God for Israel, the promise of the recognition of YHWH, and the culmination of the Exodus formula.⁷⁹

Exod 29:45-46	Gen 17:7-8	Exod 6:6-7; 7:5
ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל והייתי להם לאלהים	והקמתי את־בריתי ביני ובינך ובין זרעך אחר־ך לדרתם לברית עולם להיות לך לאלהים ולזרעך אחר־ך	אני יהוה והוצאתי אתכם מתחת סבלת מצרים ... ולקחתי אתכם לי לעם והייתי לכם לאלהים וידעתם כי אני יהוה אלהיכם המוציא אתכם מתחת סבלות מצרים וידעו מצרים כי־אני יהוה בנטתי את־ידי על־מצרים והוצאתי את־בני־ישראל מתוכם
וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים לשכני בתוכם אני יהוה אלהיהם	ונתתי לך ולזרעך אחר־ך את ארץ מגידך את כל־ארץ כנען לאחזת עולם והייתי להם לאלהים	

Exodus 29:45-46 intertwines the promise of the land, the promise of the covenant, the self-revelation formula, and the promise of YHWH being God for Israel from Gen 17 and Exod 6.⁸⁰ As noted by Schmid, Exod 29:45-46 places the emphasis of the covenant promises on the indwelling of YHWH among Israel, rather than land inheritance.⁸¹ The purpose of the Exodus in this light is for YHWH to dwell among Israel (לשכני בתוכם), and Exod 29:45-46 can rightfully be seen as the goal of history in the Priestly narrative, as Israel comes to decisively know YHWH as the culmination of the full meaning of the self-revelation formulae.⁸² This does not mean however that Exod 29:43-46 is the end of the Priestly narrative, which requires the completion of

⁷⁸ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 326; Ruwe, *Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift*, 103-115.

⁷⁹ Wöhrle, *Fremdlinge im eigenen Land*, 159; Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 243-45.

⁸⁰ Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 324; Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 287.

⁸¹ Schmid, *Genesis and the Moses Story*, 244.

⁸² Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 243; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 148, 185; Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 227-28.

the Tabernacle and the filling of the Tabernacle with the כבוד יהוה in Exod 40:17, 33-35.⁸³

6.3.4 The Conclusion of the Tabernacle Account Exodus 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-34

Since the studies of Martin Noth, there has been a gradual tendency to decrease the extent of the Priestly narrative in the execution report in Exod 35-40. Exceptions to this are Victor Hurowitz, who argues based on ancient Near Eastern parallel building accounts that we ought to expect the execution report to be more extensive than the instruction report,⁸⁴ and also Rainer Albertz.⁸⁵ The most radical in diminishing the execution report is Eckart Otto, whose Priestly narrative ends in Exod 29:46.⁸⁶ Against Otto it is noted that the Tabernacle account would require an account of its establishment and completion. Thomas Pola maintains only a minimal Priestly narrative in the execution report with Exod 40:16, 17, 33b.⁸⁷ The view that is gaining most favor for the conclusion of the Tabernacle account considers its parallels with the Priestly creation account of Gen 1:1–2:4a. From this perspective, the conclusion to the Priestly Tabernacle would parallel the completion of the work of creation, and would need to include Exod 39:32, 43 as the conclusion to the "creation" of the Tabernacle, as well as Exod 40:17, 33-35 as the culmination to the motif of the כבוד יהוה indwelling the Tabernacle.⁸⁸ Rabbinical scholars had already described the building of

⁸³ Ibid., 165.

⁸⁴ Victor Hurowitz, "The Priestly Account of the Tabernacle," *JAOS* 105.1 (1985): 26-30.

⁸⁵ Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 379-80.

⁸⁶ Otto, "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 26-27. So also Wöhrle, *Fremdlinge im eigenen Land*, 159.

⁸⁷ Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 298.

⁸⁸ Peter Weimar (39:32b, 43; 40:17, 34; *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 22n18), Christian Frevel (39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34f.; *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 145), Christophe Nihan (39:32, 42-43; 40:17, 34-35; *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 57-58), Bernd Janowski (39:32b, 43; 40:17, 34-35; "Tempel und Schöpfung," 48-50), Martin Noth (39:32, [42?], 43; 40:17; *Exodus*, 274-75, 280, 282), Norbert Lohfink (39:32-33a, 42-43; 40:17, 33b-35; "The Priestly Narrative and History," 145n29), Susanne Owczarek (39:32b, 43; 40:17, 34ff.; *Die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes*, 52), and Karl Elliger (39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b, 34; "Sinn und Ursprung," 121-22) more or less follow this line of argument.

the sanctuary as the moment in which "die Weltschöpfung abgeschlossen, ja die Schöpfungsabsicht Gottes vollendet."⁸⁹ The parallels with the Priestly creation account can be seen from the following chart:⁹⁰

Exodus		Genesis	
39:43a	וירא משה את־כל־המלאכה והנה עשו אתה כאשר צוה יהוה בן עשו	1:31a	וירא אלהים את־כל־אשר עשה והנה־טוב מאד
39:32a	ותכל כל־עבדת משכן אהל־מועד	2:1	ויכלו השמים והארץ וכל־צבאם
40:33b	ויכל משה את־המלאכה	2:2a	ויכל אלהים ביום השביעי מלאכתו
39:43b	ויברך אתם משה	2:3a	ויברך אלהים את־יום השביעי

This association with creation and temple building is strengthened by ancient Near Eastern parallels.⁹¹ Both Mesopotamian and Egyptian traditions associated the temple with a model of creation.⁹² The reference to New Year's day in Exod 40:17 also associates the building of the sanctuary with the creation account in Gen 1:1–2:4a, following a common ancient Near Eastern literary pattern of creation-combat-temple-building:

Exod 40:17 ויהי בחדש הראשון בשנה השנית באחד לחדש הוקם המשכן

The chronology is linked to the departure from Egypt and YHWH's victory over Pharaoh at the Sea in Exod 14. As noted by Nihan, this follows the pattern of the *Enuma elish*, where the sanctuary of Marduk is built to celebrate his victory over Tiamat one year after the combat.⁹³ Janowski summarizes that in ancient Near Eastern ideolo-

⁸⁹ Peter Schäfer, "Tempel und Schöpfung: Zur Interpretation einiger Heiligtumstraditionen in der rabbinischen Literatur," *Kairos* 16 (1974): 132.

⁹⁰ From Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 306-307.

⁹¹ Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 216-223; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 55-62; Hurowitz, *I Have Built you an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and North-West Semitic Writings* (JSOTSup 315; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992), 242; Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord," 504-508.

⁹² Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 216-223. The creation of the world and sanctuary building is prominently linked in the Gudea Cylinders, and in Egyptian tradition particularly the architecture of the temples makes this connection clear.

⁹³ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 55. The connection with New Year's day also associates the completion of the Tabernacle with the subsiding of the flood in the Priestly flood account in Gen 8:13 and indicates the start of a new era (Dozeman, *Exodus*, 764; Weimar, *Studien zur*

gy, the temple is the earthly representation of the divine mountain from the beginning of creation, which represents a piece of heaven on earth.⁹⁴ This ancient Near Eastern literary pattern, as well as the linguistic ties of Exod 39-40 to Gen 1:31-2:3, point to the inclusion of Exod 39:32, 43; 40:33 to the base Priestly narrative as part of the pattern of creation and restoration of creation developing in the Priestly narrative.

The second important theme that is concluded in Exodus 40 is the motif of the כבוד יהוה, which brackets the Tabernacle pericope in Exod 24:15-18* and 40:33b-35:

Exod 40:33b	ויכל משה את־המלאכה
Exod 40:34	ויכס הענן את־אהל מועד וכבוד יהוה מלא את־המשכן
Exod 40:35	ולא־יכל משה לבוא אל־אהל מועד כי שכן עליו הענן וכבוד יהוה מלא את־המשכן

Verses 33b-35 are maintained to varying degrees in the Priestly narrative by Pola (v.33b), Weimar (v.34), Frevel (vv.33b-35), Nihan (vv.34-35), Lohfink (vv.33b-35), and Elliger (vv.33b-34). There is no compelling reason to deny vv.33b-35 as a part of the concluding statement of the Priestly Tabernacle narrative. In conclusion, the original execution report of the Priestly narrative consists in Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b-35, which describes the establishment of the Tabernacle as the completion of creation, and brings the motif of the indwelling of the כבוד יהוה in the Tabernacle to conclusion. The remainder of Exod 35-40* is widely considered secondary to this brief execution report of the Tabernacle.⁹⁵ The Tabernacle account of the base Priestly narrative is thus considered to be Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2a, 8; 29:43-46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b-35.

Priesterschrift, 303).

⁹⁴ Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 221.

⁹⁵ On secondary character of Exod 35-40, see the discussion below.

6.3.5 The Sabbath texts of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 as part of the Priestly Narrative

Apart from the base Priestly narrative of Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33b-35 delineated above, which corresponds in its main features with the proposals of Otto, Pola, Weimar, Frevel, Nihan, Janowski, Noth, Lohfink, and Elliger, against the general consensus, there are good reasons to consider Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 as also part of the base Priestly narrative. The reasons for excluding the Sabbath texts of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 from the Priestly narrative are due to its position following Exod 30:1-31:11 which is widely agreed to be secondary to the Priestly narrative,⁹⁶ and due to the similarities of 31:12-17; 35:1-3 with the language and Sabbath concepts of the Holiness Code, and the corresponding presumption that the text differs from the covenant theology seen elsewhere in the Priestly narrative.⁹⁷

First of all, to respond to the objections as to why the Sabbath texts in Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 are excluded from the Priestly narrative, the position of Exod 31:12-17 following secondary material in Exod 30:1-31:11 is not a valid objection.⁹⁸ In the same way that Exod 29:43-46 is separated from Exod 25:1-2a, 8 by what is considered secondary material in Exod 25-29*, it is possible that Exod 31:12-17 could be separated from Exod 29:43-46 in the process of inserting Exod 30:1-31:11. Second, the presence of language and concepts similar to the Holiness Code in Exod

⁹⁶ Wellhausen, *Composition*, 137-141; Kuenen, *An Historico-Critical Inquiry*, 72-73; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 33; Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 98n104.

⁹⁷ See the discussion in Stackert, "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath," 5-6; Gross, "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45: Sprachliche Form und theologisch-konzeptionelle Leistung," in *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und seinem Umfeld: Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Old Hannes Steck* (eds. R.G.Kratz and Thomas Krüger; OBO 153; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1997), 46.

⁹⁸ Stackert, "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath," 7. So according to Ernst Jenni, Exod 29:42-46 originally immediately preceded Exod 31:12-17, before 30:1-31:11 was added in between (*Die theologische Begründung des Sabbatgebotes* [Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1956], 22).

31:12-17 should not be used as criteria to assigning the text to a secondary layer, as seen in the discussion of the Passover in Exod 12* and circumcision in Gen 17:9-14 discussed above. If it is considered from the beginning that Gen 1:1–2:4a aligns conceptually with the Holiness Composition, then there is no problem seeing references to the Sabbath in Exod 31:12-17 as likewise part of the same layer as Gen 1:1–2:4a. Despite the widespread exclusion of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 from the Priestly narrative, a few scholars have argued that parts of 31:12-17; 35:1-3, or as a whole, these Sabbath texts are an important part of the overall Priestly conception of the Sabbath and Sinai account, and should not be removed from the Priestly narrative. I will contend that Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 can be read as a unified whole that has integrated Sabbath traditions into an intentionally structured Sabbath-compendium, and attempts at source-division of the text are unwarranted. Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 can be read as an integral part of the developing concept of the Sabbath and covenant systems in the Priestly narrative ranging from the creation of the Sabbath in Gen 1:1–2:4a and including the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants, as an important text that integrates Sinai into the Priestly narrative. Ancient Near Eastern accounts of temple building which include the notion of rest support the proposal that also the Priestly Tabernacle account would have included the notion of divine rest as an integral part.

6.3.5.1 On the Unity of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3

Since the work of von Rad, several scholars who accepted an original Priestly strand in Exod 31:12-17 have proposed to divide Exod 31:12-17 into various strata.⁹⁹

Recently this has been argued for by Jeffrey Stackert and Saul Olyan, who divide the

⁹⁹ Von Rad divides Exod 31:12-17 into PA in vv.12,13b,14; and PB in vv.13a, 15,16,17 (*Priesterschrift*, 62-63, 216-217). Stackert considers 31:12, 13a, 15-17 as P, and 13b-14 as H ("Compositional Strata," 18-19). Olyan takes vv.12-15 as H, and vv.16-17 as P ("Exodus 31:12–17: The Sabbath According to H, or the Sabbath According to P and H?" *JBL* 124 [2005]: 209-210). Noth considered vv.15-17 an addition (*Exodus*, 241).

section into P and H material, as well as Matthias Köckert, who argues for the presence of four different layers in the text.¹⁰⁰ Von Rad divides the section based on perceived differences in the addressees,¹⁰¹ whereas the analysis of Stackert and Olyan is based on the presence of doublets and the notion that P sections of Exod 31:12-17 are consistent in language with the P creation account in Gen 1:1–2:4a, and H sections of Exod 31:12-17 are consistent with the peculiar terminology of the Holiness Code. Stackert's view is based on the narrative coherence of P, and he takes 31:15 as the starting point of his identification of P, but Olyan however assigns v.15 to H. According to Stackert, in the developing Priestly narrative there has not yet been a revelation of the knowledge of the Sabbath to Israel. Stackert removes Exod 16 and 20:8-11 from his independent Priestly source, and takes Exod 31:15 as the first definition of the Sabbath for Israel in P. The references to *שבתתי* and *השבת* in 31:13, 14 presume knowledge of a definite Sabbath, which according to Stackert is not defined in the Priestly narrative until 31:15, and hence 31:13-14 are secondary and assigned to H.¹⁰² Stackert's strata analysis is thus based on the questionable notion that there has been no prior definition of the Sabbath to Israel in the sequence of the Priestly narrative, but to argue so requires removing Exod 16 and 20:8-11. This however is an unwarranted starting point, and if it is allowed with most scholars that Exod 16 and 20:8-11 contain references to the Sabbath known prior to Exod 31:15 in the Priestly narrative, then Stackert's analysis breaks down. Nor can the *Numeruswechsel* and doublets, which can be explained by focalization and shifts in the perspective of the addressee,¹⁰³ nor the presence of "H" language be used as a reliable criteria in dividing

¹⁰⁰ Köckert, *Leben im Gottest Gegenwart*, 53-56.

¹⁰¹ Von Rad, *Priesterschrift*, 62-63.

¹⁰² Stackert, "Compositional Strata," 14-15.

¹⁰³ Van den Eynde, "Keeping God's Sabbath *אֹת* and *בְּרִית* (Exod 31:12-17)," in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction - Reception - Interpretation* (BETL 126; Leuven: Leuven University Press,

the section. Most scholars have argued rather for the unity of the text as an intentionally structured chiasm, despite its doublets and use of various traditions.¹⁰⁴ This intentional structure suggests that it is a formally unified composition.¹⁰⁵ Genesis 9 and 17, which introduce signs and eternal covenants, likewise have a chiastic structure.¹⁰⁶ The following chart highlights the chiastic structure of the text:

	Achenbach		Grünwaldt, Gross, Timmer, Propp
31:13	אך את־שבתתי תשמרו כי <u>אות</u> הוא ביני וביניכם לדרתיכם	A	A my sabbaths B a sign between me and you C for your generations D in order to know... E and observe the Sabbath
31:14	לדעת כי אני יהוה מקדשכם ושמרתם את־השבת כי <u>קדש</u> הוא לכם מחלליה מות יומת כי כל־העשה בה מלאכה ונכרתה הנפש ההוא	B	
31:15	מקרב עמיה ששת ימים יעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי שבת שבתון <u>קדש</u> ליהוה כל־העשה מלאכה ביום השבת מות יומת	C	F shall surely be killed G for anyone who works on it
31:16	ושמרו בני־ישראל את־השבת לעשות את־השבת לדרתם ברית עולם	B'	H six days....and on the seventh day G' anyone who works on the Sabbath F' shall surely be killed E' and the children of Israel shall observe the Sabbath D' in order to do it C' for your generations
31:17	ביני ובין בני ישראל <u>אות</u> הוא לעלם כי־ששת ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ וביום השביעי שבת וינפש	A'	B' between me and the sons of Israel an eternal sign A' and on the seventh day he rested

1996), 506. So according to Van den Eynde, the text is "very well structured" (507).

¹⁰⁴ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 567-68; Achenbach, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen," 157; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 170-72; Michael Fox, "The Sign of the Covenant," 576; Jenni, "Die theologische Begründung des Sabbatgebotes," 19-21; Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 247-48, 250; Gross, "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45," 45-46; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 16 as a unified H text, and Milgrom, "H_q in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 29; King, *Realignment of the Priestly Literature*, 145-49; Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 44-45; Van Eynde, "Keeping God's Sabbath אות and ברית (Exod 31:12-17)," 504-507. Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 172, following the model of N. Negretti, *Il Settimo Giorno: Indagine critico-teologica delle tradizioni presacerdotali e sacerdotali circa il sabato biblico* (AnBib 55; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973), 226.

¹⁰⁵ Gross, "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45," 45-46; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 172.

¹⁰⁶ Fox, "The Sign of the Covenant," 571; Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 44n77.

In the model of Achenbach, sections A and A' have the Sabbath as a sign (אות) as their theme, while sections B and B' focus on the notion of the holiness (קדש) of the Sabbath for Israel (v.14) and for YHWH (v.16). The center of the chiasm contains the threat of punishment for violation of the Sabbath (v.14b). The model by Negretti, Gross, Grünwaldt, and Timmer focuses on the individual phrases of the text, having v.15a ששת ימים יעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה as expressing the "heart of the author," with the surrounding verses interpreting this statement.¹⁰⁷ The text is best understood as a "Sabbath-compendium"¹⁰⁸ that combines diverse texts relating to the Sabbath from throughout the Hebrew Bible:¹⁰⁹

	Exodus 31:12-17	Related Sabbath texts
31:13	אך את־שבתתי תשמרו	את־שבתתי תשמרו Lev 19:3, 30; ומקדשי תיראו אני יהוה 26:2 וגם את־שבתותי נתתי להם Ezek 20:12
	כי אות הוא ביני וביניכם לדרתיכם לדעת כי אני יהוה מקדשכם ושמרתם את־השבת	להיות לאות ביני וביניהם לדעת כי אני יהוה מקדשם שִׁמְר שבת מְחַלְלו Is 56:2 ישמרו את־שבתותי Is 56:4 כל־שֹׁמֵר שבת מְחַלְלו Is 56:6
14	כי קדש הוא לכם מחלליה מות יומת כי כל־העשה בה מלאכה ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מקרב עמיה	שמור את־יומם השבת לקדשו Deut 5:12 ומחללים את־יומם השבת Neh 13:17 כל־העשה בו מלאכה יומת Exod 35:2 ונכרתה הנפש ההוא Num 15:30
15	ששת ימים יעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה כל־העשה מלאכה ביום השבת מות יומת	ששת ימים תעשה מלאכה Lev 23:3 וביום השביעי שבת שבתון מקרא־קדש כל־מלאכה לא תעשו שבת הוא ליהוה
16	ושמרו בני־ישראל את־השבת לעשות ¹¹⁰ את־השבת	לעשות את־יומם השבת Deut 5:15

¹⁰⁷ Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 172.

¹⁰⁸ Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 99n108.

¹⁰⁹ Achenbach, "Heiligkeitgesetz und Sakrale Ordnungen," 158. For a detailed list and discussion of the parallels, see also Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 170-85, and Gross "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45," 49-56.

¹¹⁰ As noted by Shimon Bakon, לעשות also links the text to Gen 2:3 מכל־מלאכתו כי בו שבת מכל־מלאכתו ("Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath," *JBQ* 25.2 [1997]: 81).

	Gen 9:16-17	והיתה הקשת בענן וראייתה לזכר ברית עולם לדרתם ברית עולם
17	17:7	בין אלהים ובין כל־נפש... זאת אות הברית ביני ובין בני ישראל אות הוא לעולם
	17:11	והקמתי את־בריתי ביני וביןך ובין זרעך... לדרתם לברית עולם להיות לך לאלהים ונמלתם את בשר ערלתכם והיה לאות ברית ביני וביניכם והיתה בריתי בבשרכם לברית עולם
	Exod 20:11	כי ששת־ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ את־הים
	(cf. Gen 1:1–2:4a)	ואת־כל־אשר במ וינח ביום השביעי
		על־כן ברך יהוה את־יום השבת ויקדשהו
		כ־ששת ימים עשה יהוה את־השמים ואת־הארץ
		וביום השביעי שבת וינפש ¹¹¹

The purpose of Exod 31:12-17 becomes apparent in this comparison chart. The main focus of the text is to emphasize the importance of the Sabbath through motivational rationales, and to establish the Sabbath as a "sign" (אות) and eternal covenant or enduring engagement (ברית עולם),¹¹² building on the rainbow and circumcision as the respective signs for the eternal covenants with Noah (Gen 9) and Abraham (Gen 17) in the Priestly narrative.¹¹³ The meaning of the Sabbath as a sign of the eternal covenant is difficult to determine due to the ambiguity of syntax.¹¹⁴ Verse 13 calls the Sabbath a sign, whereas v.16 calls the Sabbath a ברית עולם. The closest parallel to the text is Gen 17, where circumcision is called a covenant or obligation (ברית v.10) and a sign of the covenant (v.11). Genesis 17:13 further calls circumcision "my covenant in your flesh, an everlasting covenant" (בריתי בבשרכם לברית עולם). Thus it is reasonable to presume

¹¹¹ The use of נפש is due to the influence of Exod 23:12 וביום השביעי מעשה מעשיך וביום השביעי נפש (Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 127).

¹¹² Van den Eynde notes that the Sabbath is not called a sign of the covenant, and the emphasis is on the Sabbath as a sign of recognition, preferring the translation of ברית עולם as "enduring engagement" ("Keeping God's Sabbath אות ברית [Exod 31:12-17], " 511).

¹¹³ Achenbach, "Heiligkeitgesetz und Sakrale Ordnungen," 159-160; Dillmann, *Exodus*, 330; Baentsch, *Exodus*, 267; Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 179, 185. The concept of the Sabbath as a sign is found also in Ezek 20:12, as seen in the parallels in the chart. On the relationship between Exod 31:12-17 and Ezekiel 20, see Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 173; Gross, "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45," 50-51; Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 51.

¹¹⁴ See recently the discussion in Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 53-54; Köckert, *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 101. As noted by Köckert, depending on where the accent is placed, v.16 can be understood as taking the Sabbath ברית as an "immerwährende Verpflichtung" that is the basis for Israel's relationship with YHWH, or the ברית can be an "Ausdruck für das Verhältnis zwischen Israel und Jahwe" (*Leben im Gottes Gegenwart*, 101).

Gen 17 and Exod 31 share the notion of an underlying eternal covenant (Abrahamic, Sinaitic), with an accompanying sign, the observance of which determines individual participation in the covenant.¹¹⁵ The text functions to align the Sinaitic ברית with the ברית from Gen 9; 17, with the observance of the Sabbath becoming paradigmatic for obedience to the entire Torah.¹¹⁶ The ברית that Exod 31:12-17 has in mind can be no other than the non-P Sinaitic covenant of Exod 19-24.¹¹⁷ Exodus 31:12-17 gives the Sinai pericope an "interpretive key" that adds observance of the Sabbath as a sign of the Priestly ברית עולם as a requirement for membership in the covenant community. From the perspective of Exod 31:12-17, the Sabbath makes possible the transfer of the Sinai covenant to subsequent generations.¹¹⁸ Keeping the command of the Sabbath signifies acknowledging that YHWH is God and that He sanctifies His people.¹¹⁹ The eternity of the covenant, both in Gen 17 and Exod 31, indicates that the Sinai Sabbath covenant in Exod 31 is not understood as a new covenant, but is related to the eternal Abrahamic covenant as further constituting the relationship between God and the newly established people of Israel.¹²⁰ The nuanced language of Exod 31:12-17 maintains that failure to observe the Sabbath will not affect the validity of the covenant,

¹¹⁵ Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 54. In both Gen 17:14 and Exod 31:14, individuals who break the covenant are threatened with excommunication.

¹¹⁶ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 568.

¹¹⁷ Gross, "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45," 55; Ziemer, "Schöpfung, Heiligtum, und Sabbat," 39, 55; Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 81; Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 280; Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 257.

¹¹⁸ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 280. According to Propp, the Sabbath reminds both Israel and YHWH of their covenant and confers the recurrent benefit of sanctification (*Exodus 19-40*, 492).

¹¹⁹ Van den Eynde, "Keeping God's Sabbath אֹת and ברית (Exod 31:12-17)," 507.

¹²⁰ Jenni, "Die theologische Begründung des Sabbatgebotes," 31; Christophe Dohmen, "Der Sinaibund als Neuer Bund nach Exod 19-34," in *Der Neue Bund im Alten: Zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente* (ed. Erich Zenger; QD 146; Freiburg: Herder, 1993), 77.

because the Sabbath is the sign of the covenant Israel is to observe.¹²¹ The Sabbath is the covenant that defines the relationship between God and Israel.

The Sabbath text Exod 35:1-3 is closely associated with Exod 31:12-17. Exodus 35:1-3 introduces Moses' transmission of the Sabbath command as the initial statement of the execution report for the Tabernacle, following the intervening account of the golden calf and covenant renewal ceremony in Exod 32-34. Exodus 31:12-17//35:1-3 thus form a Sabbath-frame around Exod 32-34. Moses assembles the Israelites (35:1), and conveys a statement almost identical to Exod 31:15 in 35:2:

Exod 31:15

שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים יַעֲשֶׂה מְלָאכָה וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי
שַׁבַּת שְׁבַתוֹן קֹדֶשׁ לַיהוָה
כִּלְהַעֲשֶׂה מְלָאכָה בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי מוֹת יוֹמָת

Exod 35:2

שֵׁשֶׁת יָמִים תַּעֲשֶׂה מְלָאכָה וּבַיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי
יִהְיֶה לָכֶם קֹדֶשׁ שְׁבַת שְׁבַתוֹן לַיהוָה
כִּלְהַעֲשֶׂה בּוֹ מְלָאכָה יוֹמָת

This statement places the Sabbath at a prominent position at the beginning of the Tabernacle construction report, reiterating the most important theme of the sanctity of the Sabbath and the prohibition of work from Exod 31:15.¹²² The differences between 31:15 and 35:2 are too slight to suggest that Exod 35:2 represents a deviation from 31:12-17. Exodus 35:3 does introduce as a novelty the notion that fire is not supposed to be kindled on the Sabbath day: *לֹא־תִבְעֶרוּ אֵשׁ בְּכָל־מִשְׁבְּתֵיכֶם בַּיּוֹם הַשְּׁבִיעִי*. Several scholars have argued that the prohibition of fire relates explicitly to the construction of the Tabernacle.¹²³ In its present position the prohibition is read in light of the preceding metalworking of the golden calf (Exod 32:20-24), and the following work on

¹²¹ So Andreas Schüle concludes, "It is important to note that *ברית עולם* in 31:17 stands in apposition to *sabbath*. The Sabbath is an eternal covenant. Thus, the best rendering here is 'And the Israelites shall observe the Sabbath by keeping it through the ages; (it is) an eternal covenant' ('The 'Eternal Covenant,' in the Priestly Pentateuch and the Major Prophets," in *Covenant in the Persian Period* [eds. Richard J. Bautch and Gary N. Knoppers; Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2015], 56). So also for Propp, the Sabbath as the sign of the covenant is metaphorically equivalent to the covenant itself (*Exodus 19-40*, 494).

¹²² Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 57.

¹²³ Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 491.

the Tabernacle that requires working with gold and other metals (Exod 37-38).¹²⁴ Albertz however has pointed to the specification *בכל משבתיכם* as focusing the fire prohibition to private dwellings, which could associate it with cooking, as in the Sabbath prohibition from Exod 16:23.¹²⁵ From a comparative ancient Near Eastern perspective, the Ugaritic Baal Epic associates the notions of divine rest and prohibition of fire with temple-building.¹²⁶ Though contextually the Sabbath and fire prohibitions relate immediately to the construction of the Tabernacle, the full intended meaning of the fire prohibition is beyond our grasp.¹²⁷ Despite a few objections to considering Exod 31:12-17//35:1-3 from the same strata of material,¹²⁸ currently it has become widespread to consider Exod 31:12-17 and 35:1-3 as an intentionally composed Sabbath frame around the non-Priestly account of Exod 32-34.¹²⁹

6.3.5.2 Exodus 31:12-17//35:1-3 as part of the Priestly Tabernacle Narrative

There are two significant reasons for considering the Sabbath texts of Exod 31:12-17//35:1-3 as part of the Priestly Tabernacle narrative. First, the Sabbath as a sign of the Sinai covenant is consistent with the covenant theology of Gen 9 and 17, and there are no compelling reasons to distinguish literary-critically between these conceptions of covenant. Second, ancient Near Eastern parallel literature suggests that the concepts of creation, temple building, and rest were closely associated. For this reason we would expect the temple building account of Exod 25-40, which evinces

¹²⁴ Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 188.

¹²⁵ Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 332.

¹²⁶ Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord," 504; Jon D. Levenson, *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence* (San Francisco: Harper&Row, 1988), 79.

¹²⁷ Grünwaldt, *Exil und Identität*, 192-93.

¹²⁸ E.g. Grünwaldt, who considers Exod 35:2 an older influence on Exod 31:12-17 (Ibid., 175).

¹²⁹ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 568; Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitsetz' und 'Priesterschrift,' 123-24; Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 43-60; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 16; Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 255-56, 329; Childs, *Exodus*, 542.

many other links to the Priestly creation account, to contain an original reference to the concept of Sabbath rest, following the genre of ancient Near Eastern temple building accounts.

The main reason Exod 31:12-17 is excluded from the base Priestly narrative is stated poignantly by Nihan, "The presence of a concrete sign for Yahweh's ברית is characteristic of P (Gen 9:12ff.; 17:9ff.), but the giving of a *third* sign at Mt. Sinai goes against P, which rejected the idea that the revelation of Mt. Sinai was accompanied by the conclusion of a new covenant after Gen 17."¹³⁰ According to Nihan, the concept of a covenant at Sinai is inconsistent with the covenant theology of the Priestly narrative, but does fit with the language and covenant theology of the later Lev 26, and thus the Sinai sign of Exod 31:12-17 is not from the Priestly narrative encompassing the covenants in Gen 9 and 17. As discussed above, the notion of the Priestly account rejecting the Sinai covenant is based on a conception of the Priestly covenants in Gen 9 and 17 as unconditional covenants without obligations. The problems with this conception of the Priestly covenant as developed influentially by Walther Zimmerli and Norbert Lohfink have already been addressed above, where it was shown that the Priestly covenant texts present a well-structured, consistently developing plan in Gen 9:1-17, Gen 17:1-27, and Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; and including 31:12-17. First of all, in each of these texts, ברית is used in the sense of a divine promise which is given to a narrowing circle of addressees, from the world, to Abraham's descendants, to Israel. The promise extends from fruitfulness and multiplication and the stability of heaven and earth (Gen 1:1–2:4a; 9:1-17), to the promise of the land and El Shaddai being God for Abraham's descendants (Gen 17:1-27), to the promise of YHWH re-

¹³⁰ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 567.

vealing himself to Israel and dwelling among Israel and sanctifying them (Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46, 31:13-17).

Second, each covenant promise is accompanied by a sign that symbolizes an aspect of the divine promise. The rainbow is a symbol of God committing to no longer use a flood to destroy the world (Gen 9), circumcision is associated with the promise of fruitfulness extended to Abraham (Gen 17), and the Sabbath is a sign of YHWH's commitment to be Israel's God, to dwell among Israel, and hence of Israel's sanctification (Exod 29:45-46; 31:13-17). The signs function as reminders to God and the human counterparts in the covenant, and consequently as symbols of membership in the covenant community who are recipients of the promises of God. According to Gen 9:15-16, the sign of the rainbow will remind YHWH of his commitment to not destroy Israel, in Exod 2:24; 6:5, YHWH remembers his promise to Abraham based on which he saves Israel from Egypt, and observing the Sabbath will enable Israel's restoration from exile (Lev 26).

Third, in Gen 9:1-17; 17:1-27; Exod 6:2-8; 29:45-46; 31:13-17, the covenant promise is accompanied by the required observance of various conditions, which increase in accordance to the increasing proximity to God: the command against consuming blood and murder are applied to all creation (Gen 9), circumcision is for Abraham's descendants (Gen 17), and the Sabbath and sanctification is for Israel (Exod 31). Failure to comply with the obligations leads to the offending individuals breaking or annulling (פרר) their side of the covenant, and a subsequent removal from the blessings of the covenant promises, but it does not annul the promises.

Several scholars have in fact argued that Exod 31:12-17 should be considered in the Priestly series of covenants and signs with Gen 9 and 17. Andreas Schüle writes,

...the Sabbath as a sign of eternal covenant and the requirement of Sabbath observance for Israel fit well into the covenantal theology of P. It is certainly reasonable to assume that the notion of covenant is anchored in all three parts of P's pentateuchal narrative: the primeval period (Genesis 9), the ancestral period (Genesis 17), and the Sinai events (Exodus 31). On the other hand, there is no real reason to assume that P's concept of covenant is strictly unconditional, which may have been the main reason, especially for Protestant exegetes, to assign Exodus 31:12-17 either to a pre-Priestly source or to a post-Priestly redactor.¹³¹

Already August Knobel,¹³² August Dillmann,¹³³ Theodore Nöldeke,¹³⁴ Georg Beer and Kurt Galling,¹³⁵ argued for Exod 31:12-17 belonging with the Priestly covenants of Gen 9 and 17 as the Priestly sign of the Sinai covenant. Recently in addition to Stackert and Olyan who argue for a partial inclusion of Exod 31:12-17 as the Priestly sign of the Sinai covenant in the P narrative, also Odil Hannes Steck (31:12-14),¹³⁶ Frank Moore Cross,¹³⁷ Erhard Blum (31:12-14),¹³⁸ William Brown,¹³⁹ and Benjamin Ziemer,¹⁴⁰ argue for its inclusion in the series, based on consistency with the

¹³¹ Schüle, "The 'Eternal Covenant' in the Priestly Pentateuch," 45.

¹³² Knobel assigned most of Exod 31:12-17 to the *Grundschrift*/Elohist = P, with supplements by the Jehovist (*Exodus-Levitikus*, 309-310).

¹³³ According to Dillmann, due to the connections to creation in Gen 2:2-3, and the Priestly covenants in Gen 9 and 17, "so wird man nicht zweifeln können, dass hier ein Abschnitt aus A [=P] vorliegt, in welchem er Wesen und Bedeutung des Sabbaths den Israeliten zum erstenmal erklärt werden liess (*Exodus-Levitikus*, 330).

¹³⁴ *Untersuchungen*, 55.

¹³⁵ *Exodus*, 151.

¹³⁶ Steck, *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift*, 190-91n808. See also Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 208n18, 255 who describes Exod 31:12-17 as linking back to creation, the flood, and Abraham narratives, and forward to the Holiness Code.

¹³⁷ *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 296-99.

¹³⁸ "Issues and Problems," 35n15.

¹³⁹ *Ethos of the Cosmos*, 77-89.

¹⁴⁰ According to Ziemer, "Innerhalb des Pentateuch gehört Gen 17 damit auf eine Ebene nicht nur mit Gen 1 und 9, sondern auch mit Texten wie Exod 31,12-17 und Lev 26" (*Abram-Abraham*, 302-303).

covenants in Gen 9 and 17 and an expectation that the Priestly narrative would also have an interest in a covenant at Sinai.¹⁴¹

Additional evidence for including the Sabbath in the Priestly Tabernacle account comes from comparative ancient Near Eastern literature. Moshe Weinfeld and Victor Hurowitz have especially emphasized this aspect of the Priestly Tabernacle texts.¹⁴² As shown by Weinfeld and Hurowitz, ancient Near Eastern temple-building accounts tend to follow a common pattern. Texts where the construction of a temple is associated with the completion of creation, such as the *Enuma elish*, contain the concept of the gods resting in the completed temple.¹⁴³ As noted by Hurowitz,

The motif of the gods resting in their temple, which appears in Marduk's words and in the words of the gods, is probably related to the motifs of (a) David's rest found in 2 Sam. 7.1, (b) Israel's rest found in the Solomonic temple-building story, and (c) perhaps even to the Sabbath command in the Tabernacle story (Exod. 31, 35)...¹⁴⁴

Weinfeld notes that the combination of the motifs of rest in the temple and also kindling of fire are found in the Ugaritic Baal Epic.¹⁴⁵ Daniel Timmer has also summarized the use of the motif of divine rest from the Baal Epic, the *Enuma Elish*, the Atrahasis Epic, and the Egyptian Memphite Theology and Coffin Texts of Atum.¹⁴⁶ Each

¹⁴¹ Cf. also Koch, *Priesterschrift*, 37; W.Schmidt, *Schöpfungsgeschichte*, 186; Jenni, "Theologische Grundung des Sabbath Gebote," 20.

¹⁴² Weinfeld, "Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord," 502-503; Hurowitz, "The Priestly Account of the Tabernacle," 26-30; *I Have Built you an Exalted House*; Cf. also Smith, *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*, 105-106.

¹⁴³ Hurowitz, *I Have built you an Exalted House*, 94-95. Hurowitz notes on the concept of rest in temple-building accounts and inscriptions, the Epic of Erra, the Baal Epic, prayers, and narratives (330-31).

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 95.

¹⁴⁵ So according to Weinfeld, "In the description of the building of Baal's sanctuary, which seems to be associated with creation as well, we hear of a fire burning for six days, which on the seventh day ceases (CTA 4 VI:22f.), whereupon Baal rejoices in his house and his sanctuary. This description brings to mind the command 'You shall not burn fire in any of your dwellings on the Sabbath' (Ex. 35:5), which comes before the account of the construction of the Tabernacle. In addition, the sanctuary of El in Ugarit is conceived, as in Babylonia and as in Israel, as a seat of rest. Thus we read of El who places his feet on his footstool and says... 'Now I will sit and rest.' (CTA 6 111:18), and the throne of Baal is also called a throne of rest... 'Chased him from his throne of kingship, from the restful seat of his dominion' (CTA 3 D:46-47)." ("Sabbath, Temple, and the Enthronement of the Lord," 504).

¹⁴⁶ Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 74-77.

of these texts share the concepts of creation, temple-building, and divine rest. Steck, Blum, and Ruwe likewise contend that the association of creation, temple, and rest in ancient Near Eastern temple-building traditions suggests that the Sabbath should be considered an integral part of the Priestly Tabernacle account.¹⁴⁷ As Blum concludes, Israel's keeping of the Sabbath is an important part of participation in the institution that God has sanctified (Gen 2:3 קדש) as the sanctified cultic community (Exod 31:13 אני יהוה מקדשכם), forming an integral part of the restoration of creation that takes place at the completion of the Tabernacle.¹⁴⁸ In summary, neither the location of Exod 31:12-17, nor the use of language resembling the Holiness Code are valid reasons to consider Exod 31:12-17 to be secondary to the Priestly narrative. Due to the coherence between Exod 31:12-17 and the other Priestly covenants with accompanying signs (Gen 9 and 17), and the strong association between creation, temple-building, and rest in ancient Near Eastern traditions, it is reasonable to conclude that Exod 31:12-17 and Exod 35:1-3 connected with it belong to the same Priestly sequence of covenants with Gen 9 and 17.

6.4 The Priestly Base-Layer in the Tabernacle Narrative

This analysis of the Tabernacle texts in Exodus 25-40 suggests that Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35 form the continuation of the Priestly narrative from Exod 1-16 outlined above. With the exception of the inclusion of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3, this assessment is uncontroversial and broadly agrees with the analysis presented by Pola, Weimar, Janowski, Frevel, Nihan, Noth, Lohfink, and Elliger delineated above. This Priestly Tabernacle narrative of

¹⁴⁷ Steck, *Schöpfungsbericht*, 199n837; Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift,' 106; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 309-310n82.

¹⁴⁸ Ibid., 311-12.

Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35 was added to the non-Priestly account of the Sinai covenant in Exod 19-24* and bracketed the non-Priestly golden calf and covenant renewal account in Exod 32-34*, which it framed with the Sabbath texts of Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3.

The question that remains to be considered is the relationship between the Priestly Tabernacle narratives in Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35 and the other tabernacle materials found in Exod 25-40, which can either be considered earlier traditions integrated into the Priestly narrative, or later supplements to fill out the Tabernacle account. It is almost universally agreed that Exod 30:1-31:11; and 35-40 reflect a later stage of Priestly tradition added to the base Priestly narratives.¹⁴⁹ The main question that will be considered here is the relationship of the traditions in Exod 25-29* to the base Priestly narrative that brackets these traditions with Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46. The starting point of this analysis is the different conceptions of the Tabernacle and interaction with God that are found in Exod 25-29, as mentioned briefly already above.

Utzschneider most recently, and other scholars before him have pursued a tradition-historical approach to understanding the various traditions underlying the final Priestly form of Exod 25-40. According to Utzschneider, the Tabernacle texts of Exod 25-40 contain three types of material: Exod 25:16, 21-22 represents an "ark-dwelling" conception in which Moses is presented in a prophetic office, Exodus 25:2, 8, represents the "people-sanctuary" conception, and Exod 29:43-46 the "tent of meeting"

¹⁴⁹ Since the work of Julius Popper, *Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte* (Leipzig: Heinrich Hunger, 1862), 44-46, followed by Wellhausen, *Composition*, 135-47; cf. Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 223. An exception here is Hurowitz, who argues based on ancient Near Eastern parallels that the execution report should be considered original ("The Priestly Account of the Tabernacle," 25-30; cf. also Mark George, *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space* [Atlanta: SBL Press, 2009], 6). Also according to Klostermann, Exod 25-31 and 35-40 are from the same author, who used slightly divergent sources (*Der Pentateuch*, 41). The fact that the order of Exod 35-40 is more logical than 25-31 suggests that it reflects a later stage of development.

conception.¹⁵⁰ These traditions were added onto each other successively, until they were integrated into the Priestly narrative continuing from Genesis-Exodus.¹⁵¹ As discussed above, most scholars today consider that the Tabernacle account of Exod 25-29 has combined three different conceptions of the Tabernacle, with varying degrees of confidence in the ability to reconstruct these traditions based on the distribution of central terminology: First there is a tent of meeting tradition with a focus on Moses in a prophetic office and "meeting" (יָעַד) with YHWH. The distribution of יָעַד suggests its independence, as it is found only in 25:22; 29:42-43; 30:6, 36. According to Utzschneider, this conception is centered in Exod 25:22, which scene "ist die Darstellung einer dem Heiligtum verbundenen, an die Traditionen göttlichen Rechts gebundenen Prophetie."¹⁵² As noted by Utzschneider, the sparsity of references to the conception of Exod 25:22 is surprising, given its programmatic nature formulated as instructions directed towards a fulfillment.¹⁵³ Only in Num 7:89 is there a continuation of the conception of Exod 25:22. The disappearance of this Mosaic "prophetische Ladekonzeption" speaks strongly for the fact that it is an older tradition integrated into the Priestly narrative under Priestly שָׁכַן-theology, which occurs in Exod 29:43-46 as discussed below, with the integration of the concept of the tabernacle as a אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד.¹⁵⁴

Second, there is the "heavenly tabernacle" tradition that is similar to ancient Near Eastern traditions of a heavenly sanctuary, focused on the concept of a תְּבִיטָה seen by Moses (Exod 25:9, 40).¹⁵⁵ The distribution of the terminology of תְּבִיטָה and

¹⁵⁰ Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 209.

¹⁵¹ Ibid., 230, 252-53.

¹⁵² Ibid., 118, 120.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 122.

¹⁵⁴ Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 264.

¹⁵⁵ Von Rad, *Priesterschrift*, 181; Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 242-53; Weimar,

ראה describing a viewing of the pattern of the Tabernacle revealed to Moses is telling: תבנית is found only in Exod 25:9, 40 and ראה in 25:9, 40; 26:30; 27:8. The viewing (ראה) of the תבנית stands in contrast to the verbal revelation of the building details in the context¹⁵⁶ and supports the notion of an integration of the תבנית tradition into the Priestly tabernacle account, which takes place in Exod 29:43-46 along with the יעד-conception.¹⁵⁷

Third, Exodus 26 combines instructions for a משכן in 26:1-6, 15-30 added to an earlier conception of an אהל in 26:7-14.¹⁵⁸ This conception has been integrated with the תבנית model by the bracketing of Exod 25:9//26:30, with 25:40 integrating the instructions for the utensils of the Tabernacle (כלים).¹⁵⁹

25:9	ככל אשר אני מראה אותך את תבנית המשכן ואת תבנית כל-כליו וכן תעשו
25:39-40	כבר זהב טהור יעשה אתה את כל-הכלים האלה
	וראה ועשה בתבניתם אשר-אתה מראה בהר
26:30	והקמת את-המשכן כמשפטו אשר הראית בהר

Finally, the Priestly narrative with שכן theology forms the basis of Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:8; 29:45-46; 40:17, 33-35. Whereas scholars such as Pola consider everything between the Priestly narrative in Exod 25:9 and 29:45-46 to be later additions,¹⁶⁰ there are good reasons to consider rather that with Exod 25:8-9 and 29:43-46, the Priestly account has redactionally integrated earlier traditions. It was already discussed above how Exod 29:43-46 links the Priestly Tabernacle texts to the Priestly covenant

Studien zur Priesterschrift, 283n45.

¹⁵⁶ Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 253.

¹⁵⁷ Otto ("Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 27) and Weimar consider the תבנית conception in Exod 25:10-40 a later addition (*Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 283n45).

¹⁵⁸ Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 255; Otto, "Forschungen," 26; Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 335. Also according to Görg, this is a pre-Priestly tent-conception added into P (*Zelt*, 21).

¹⁵⁹ On the connection of Exod 25:9 to Exod 26:1-30, see Otto, "Forschungen," 26-27.

¹⁶⁰ Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 262-64.

promises of Gen 17:7-8 and Exod 6:6-7. Additionally, verses 43-44 connect the text to the pre-Priestly Tabernacle traditions in Exod 25-29*:

Exodus 29:42-46		Exodus parallel texts
v.42 עלת תמיד לדרתיכם פתח אהל-מועד	26:9	אל-מול פני האהל
לפני יהוה אשר <u>אועד</u> לכם <u>שמה</u> לדבר	25:22	<u>ונועדתי לך שם</u> ודברתי אתך מעל הכפרת מבין שני הכרבים אשר על-ארץ העדת
v.43 <u>ונעדת</u> שמה <u>לבני</u> ישראל ונקדש בכבדי	24:16	את כל-אשר אצוה אותך אל-בני ישראל וישכן כבוד-יהוה על-הר סיני
	40:34	ויכס הענן את-אהל מועד וכבוד יהוה מלא את-המשכן
v.44 <u>וקדשתי</u> את-אהל מועד ואת-המזבח ואת-אהרן ואת-בניו <u>אקדש</u> <u>לכהן</u> לי	28:1	ואתה הקרב אליך את-אהרן אחיך ואת-בניו <u>לכהנו לי</u>
	v.3	ואתה תדבר אל-כל-חכמי לב וועשו את-בגדי אהרן לקדשו <u>לכהנו לי</u>
	v.41	והלבשת אתם את-אהרן אחיך ואת-בניו אתו ומשחת אתם ומלאת את-ידים <u>וקדשת אתם וכהנו לי</u>
v.45 ושכנתי בתוך בני ישראל והייתי להם לאלהים	Gen 17:7-8	והקמתי את-בריתי... להיות לך לאלהים והייתי להם לאלהים
v.46 וידעו כי אני יהוה אלהיהם אשר הוצאתי אתם מארץ מצרים אני יהוה אלהיהם לשכני בתוכם	Exod 6:6-7	אני יהוה והוצאתי אתכם מתחת סבלת מצרים... ולקחתני אתכם לי לעם והייתי לכם לאלהים וידעתם כי אני יהוה אלהיכם המוציא אתכם מתחת סבלות מצרים

Exodus 29:43-46 provides the interpretive framework for understanding the Priestly covenants linking to Gen 17 and Exod 6, and provides an interpretation of the dwelling (vv. 45-46 שכן) of the כבוד יהוה among Israel (Exod 24:16; 40:34-35; cf. Exod 29:43). As noted by Blum, Exod 29:43-46 is a dense web of theologically significant sanctuary concepts linking the motifs of קדש, יעד, אהל מועד, and שכן from the Tabernacle traditions in Exod 25-29 to combine the theologies of transcendence and immanence.¹⁶¹ The use of קדש, יעד, and שכן unite the three sanctuary conceptions

¹⁶¹ Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 297-98. Koch has called the text "eine pointierte Zusammenfassung der Gedanken von P über den Sinn des gesamten Heiligtums samt seiner Priesterschaft" (*Priesterschrift*, 31). Cf. also Walter Moberly, *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34* (JSOTSup 22; Sheffield: University of Sheffield Press, 1983), 34.

of מקדש, אהל מועד, and משכן encountered in Exod 25-29.¹⁶² Against Pola and Weimar who argue that vv.43-44 are later than vv.45-46, there is good reason to include these verses in the Priestly narrative with Nihan, Pola, Lohfink, Elliger, Frevel, Otto, and Janowski.¹⁶³ Exodus 29:43-44 form an inclusio with Exod 25-29* and integrate the Mosaic prophetic-ark conception of the Tabernacle in Exod 25:22.¹⁶⁴ Exod 29:43 locates the place of revelation (שמה) at the opening of the tent of meeting, which appears to require v.42 and preceding material included within it,¹⁶⁵ and it is no longer Moses alone who encounters YHWH (25:22 ונועדתי לך שם), but the Israelites (29:43 ונועדתי שמה לבני ישראל).¹⁶⁶ The purpose of the encounter with YHWH is no longer to speak to Moses or the Israelites, but to dwell among Israel, as stated in vv.45-46. The text is an etiology that explains the previously obscure concept of the אהל מועד, but at the same time integrates it with the שכן indwelling theology of vv.45-46.¹⁶⁷ As argued by Eckart Otto, 29:42b-44 is inseparably connected with Exod 29:1-42a, as well as

¹⁶² Otto, "Forschungen," 26.

¹⁶³ Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 275n22; Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 255; Cf. especially here Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 97-102; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 36-38; Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," 145n29; Otto, "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift," 26-27; Janowski, "Tempel und Schöpfung," 48-50; Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 121-22.

¹⁶⁴ Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 235.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 235. Exod 29:42-46 also evinces a conflict between the opening of the tent of meeting and the כפרת of Exod 25:22 as the location of revelation, which conflict Görg has ascribed to the *Vorlagen* (Zelt, 59).

¹⁶⁶ Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 64-65, 195; Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 273. Solving these problems by modifying לכם (MT) in v.42 to match the singular אליך in the LXX misses the point that the tension is an intentional result of the combination of different conceptions of speaking and encountering (Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 207).

¹⁶⁷ Janowski, *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen*, 326. Cf. Kearney, "The abrupt sequences caused by the positioning of 27:20-21 and 30:1-10 make it likely that the redactor is working with older blocks of material concerning the garments of Aaron (ch. 28) and his priestly ordination (ch. 29). The prior section on the Dwelling also appears to be a distinct source, especially because the name 'Dwelling' does not recur in ch. 25-31 after 27:19. The redactor has strengthened the link between his two major sections on the Dwelling (ch. 25-27) and on Aaron (ch. 28-29) by means of a 'false conclusion' (29:42-46), which seems to draw the first speech to a close. Here the mention of Aaron, the altar (of holocausts) and the Tent of Meeting is joined with God's promise to 'dwell' (Skn) among the Israelites. The redactor thus alludes to the 'Dwelling' of ch. 25-27, thereby drawing together all that has preceded in the first speech" ("Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Exod 25-40," *ZAW* 89 [1977]: 376).

much of Exod 26-28.¹⁶⁸ Exodus 29:42-44 requires the concept of the אהל in Exod 26:7-11 and its combination with the משכן tradition to be comprehensible, and the consecration of the priests in Exodus 28 is presupposed in 29:44.¹⁶⁹ Similarly Utzschneider notes that Exod 29:43-44 presupposes familiarity with the tent of meeting, the altar, and the priesthood from Exod 25-29*.¹⁷⁰ The Tabernacle conception of Exod 29:42-46 is a type of summary that has integrated various texts from Exod 25-29 and has been redactionally "built over" them.¹⁷¹ The same is argued by Peter Weimar for the relationship of Exod 29:42b-44 with 27:1-29:42a, which according to Weimar presupposes 27:1-29:42a, but contains language that is unusual to the Priestly narrative and should be considered later additions.¹⁷² Whereas the consecration of the priests in Exod 28:1-41 describes Moses as the one who consecrates the priests to service (28:41 וְקִדְשְׁתָּ אֹתָם וְכִהְנוּ לִי), in Exod 29:43-44 YHWH himself is the active agent involved in consecration: וְקִדַּשְׁתִּי אֶת־אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד וְאֶת־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ וְאֶת־אֹהֶרֶן וְאֶת־בָּנָיו אֶקְדֹּשׁ לְכַהֵן לִי. Exodus 29:44 thus links back to Exod 28:1-5, which is a key connecting text between Exod 25-27 and 28-29.¹⁷³ The sequence of Exod 29:44 thus coincides with the structure of Exod 25-29, with the tent (Exod 26), the altar (Exod 27), and priests

¹⁶⁸ Otto, "Forschungen," 26. This also goes against Lohfink and Frevel, who argue that the Priestly narrative continued from Exod 26:30 to 29:43 without the intervening Exod 27-29 (Lohfink, "The Priestly Narrative and History," 145n29; Frevel, *Mit Blick auf Das Land*, 103). Frevel is thus required to remove 29:44b, which presupposes the material of Exod 27-29*.

¹⁶⁹ Otto, "Forschungen," 26.

¹⁷⁰ Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 206n13.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 253.

¹⁷² Weimar, *Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 275n22.

¹⁷³ Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 218-19, 252-53; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 51-53. On the other hand, Frevel and others argue that the Priestly consecration of Exod 28, presupposed in Exod 29:44b is secondary to the base Priestly Tabernacle narrative (Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 103; Steins, "Sie sollen mir ein Heiligtum machen," 161). This corresponds with the arguments of Pola and Otto, who consider the original Priestly narrative as having ended in the Tabernacle pericope, and thus without a continuation in Leviticus 8-9. The differing conception of Moses consecrating as the subject of consecration (קִדֵּשׁ) continues in Lev 8:10-12, 15, 30 as part of the same conception as Exod 28, with Moses as the subject each time.

(Exod 28-29) consecrated in the same order.¹⁷⁴ In summary, Exod 29:43-46 is best understood as a summarizing text that integrates the various Priestly traditions between Exod 25:8-29:42 into the Priestly narrative.¹⁷⁵ Based on ancient Near Eastern parallels noted by Hurowitz, Haran, Cross, and others, the various traditions within Exod 25-29* were likely written sources utilized by the Priestly Tabernacle account.¹⁷⁶ Given what we know of ancient Near Eastern scribal practices, it is unrealistic to expect to reconstruct these sources completely, as they would have been modified in their integration into the Priestly narrative.¹⁷⁷ Nevertheless, the traces of different terms and conceptions of the Tabernacle evince the presence of these traditions. The Priestly narrative with its integrated materials finally was supplemented by post-Priestly materials in Exod 27:20-21; 30:1-31:11, and 35-40*.¹⁷⁸ Whether or not the consecration of

¹⁷⁴ Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 51. Nevertheless, Exod 28-29 has undergone later redactions.

¹⁷⁵ These traditions likely continue into Lev 8-9 as well, as noted by Nihan on the connection of Exod 29:43-44 to Lev 8-9 (*From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 53). But see also Owczarek, who argues for Lev 8 as secondary, and Exod 29 as even later (*Die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes*, 73-77).

¹⁷⁶ Especially Hurowitz and Cross have argued for the utilization of sources from temple archives as the origins for the material in Exod 25-29*. Cf. Hurowitz, "The Priestly Account of Building the Tabernacle," 24-29; *I Have Built you an Exalted House*, 250-259, on ancient Near Eastern temple-building descriptions Cross, "The Priestly Tabernacle in the Light of Recent Research," in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times* (ed. Avraham Biran; Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College Press, 1981), 169; *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*, 320. With varying differences in detail, Von Rad (*Priesterschrift*, 179-84), Koch (*Priesterschrift*, 96-98), Knohl (*Sanctuary of Silence*, 63-64), Blum (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 301-12), Utzschneider (*Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 236-58; "Tabernacle," 298-99), Albertz (*Exodus 19-40*, 13), and Milgrom, ("HQ in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah," 31) have argued for the different conceptions in Exod 25-29* as evidence of the integration of earlier written traditions.

¹⁷⁷ According to Weimar, the redactional process of Exodus 25-31* has distorted these traditions almost beyond recognition (*Studien zur Priesterschrift*, 271). Also according to Koch, the original wording of these ritual *Vorlagen* can no longer be recovered, since the Priestly narrative has edited and extended them in the presentation of the Priestly Tabernacle (*Priesterschrift*, 98).

¹⁷⁸ Exod 27:20-21 describes the eternal lamp which is to be lit in the tent of meeting and aligns closely with Lev 24:1-4, and is assigned to a later stage of Holiness school activity (Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 171-72; Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 47-48; Milgrom, *Leviticus 17-22*, 1338). Likewise the materials in Exod 35-40 that reflect the all-Israelite contributions to the Tabernacle can be understood broadly from the perspective of the Holiness Code's emphasis on all Israelites being invested in the Tabernacle, and can be considered from a later stage of activity in the Holiness School (Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 66-67).

the priests is part of the integrated material in Exod 28; 29:44, or is a later addition,

the remarks of Frevel on the Priestly narrative in Exod 25-40 are significant:

Nicht die Legitimation der Priester bildet das Zentrum der Priesterschriftlichen Sinaiperikope, sondern die unmittelbare, sich selbst einbringende, heiligende und sühnende Gottesnähe und damit die Gemeinschaft YHWHs mit dem von ihm befreiten *Volk Israel*. Die Konzentration auf Kult und Priestertum findet in der Sinaiperikope erst in der Nacharbeit zur Priestergrundschrift statt.¹⁷⁹

This conclusion corresponds with the earlier views of Elliger and Von Rad, who noted that despite the massive amount of Priestly material within Ex-Lev, the interests of the Priestly narrative are not very "priestly," with the cult and priesthood placed in the background.¹⁸⁰ The concerns of the Priestly narrative from Gen 1:1–2:4a, through the texts in Exod 1-16, and in the Sinai pericope in 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35 relate to the concepts of creation, Sabbath, and covenant, and culminating with the indwelling of YHWH among Israel in the Tabernacle.

6.5 The Base Priestly Narrative of the Sinai Tabernacle Account and its Function as Part of the Holiness Composition

The continuous Priestly material in the Sinai Tabernacle account has proven to be Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35.

The following chart illustrates the relationship of this Priestly narrative material to the *Vorlagen* it utilizes and the non-Priestly material in Ex 32-34 that it structures.¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ Frevel, *Mit Blick auf das Land*, 148.

¹⁸⁰ Elliger, "Sinn und Ursprung," 139-142; Von Rad, *Priesterschrift*, 187-88.

¹⁸¹ The pre-Priestly *Vorlagen* here means traditions pertaining to the Tabernacle and cult that area earlier than the Priestly base narrative of Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35, and which have been incorporated into this composition, as argued in footnote 620 above. The post-Priestly supplements in Exod 30-31 and 35-40 were added to the Tabernacle account after its structuring by the Priestly base narrative of Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35. The non-Priestly material of Ex 32-34 represents what in traditional scholarship is called J or E material, and forms the continuation of the non-Priestly narratives from Ex 1-24.

Exod 24:15b-18a	Integration of the כבוד יהוה into dwelling (שכן) in the Tabernacle and the establishment of the creation rhythm with the 6/7 day scheme
25:1-2b, 8	Instructions for building a מקדש for YHWH to dwell (שכן) among Israel
25:9-29:42*	Incorporation of pre-Priestly <i>Vorlagen</i> : תבנית, משכן, and אהל מועד traditions, Mosaic ark-dwelling conception (Ex 25:22), Priestly consecration (Ex 28-29*)
29:43-46	Integrates the pre-Priestly יעד and שכן tabernacle traditions and Priestly inauguration traditions from Ex 25:9-29:42 into the Priestly conception of מקדש/קדש holiness. Connects to the covenant blessings in Gen 17 and Exod 6 as the fulfillment of YHWH becoming the God of Israel through His indwelling among Israel. Culmination of recognition statements, and interpretation of the Exodus as for the purpose of YHWH dwelling among Israel.
Post-Priestly supplements Exod 30:1-31:11	
31:12-17	Culmination of revelation of Sabbath as a sign (אֹת) of Israel's sanctification for the Sinai covenant, in the sequence of the Noahic and Abrahamic covenants (Gen 9, 17).
Exod 32-34	Non-Priestly Golden Calf and Covenant Renewal: Shares many themes with the surrounding Priestly account, most notably the presence of YHWH, meaning of the Exodus, status of Aaron, and the covenant
35:1-3	Framing of the non-Priestly Golden Calf and Covenant Renewal traditions with the Sabbath command, creating a chiasm around Exod 32-34 and forming the structure of the Tabernacle account as command (Exod 25-31) and execution report (35-40).
Post-Priestly supplements Exod 35-40*	
39:32, 43 40:17, 33-35	Completion of Tabernacle in analogy to the completion of creation (Gen 1:31-2:3). The כבוד יהוה indwells the sanctuary, fulfilling Exod 24:15b-18a and 29:45-46.

The relationship between the Priestly narratives (Exod 25-31, 35-40) and the non-Priestly narrative of the golden calf and covenant renewal that they surround (Exod 32-34) has been a debated question. Exodus 32-34 consists of a turning away from God (32:1-29), the intercession by Moses and God's forgiveness (32:30-34:9), and covenant renewal (34:10-34:35), that constitutes a negative counterpart and negation

to the preceding salvation history and covenant of Exod 1-24.¹⁸² The Priestly and non-Priestly sections are united by several common themes, seen in the following chart.¹⁸³

Theme	Priestly Texts	Exodus 32-34
Presence of God ¹⁸⁴	YHWH (כבוד יהוה) ¹⁸⁵ dwells among Israel (40:33-35; 29:45-46; 25:8 שכן) אהל מועד (Exod 25:8; 29:43-46) The cloud covers (ויכס הענן) the Tent of Meeting (אהל מועד), the glory (כבוד) fills the Tabernacle (משכן) (40:34-35) ¹⁸⁶	The people of Israel want gods to go before them (32:1 ילכו לפנינו) YHWH will not go in the midst (בקרבו) of Israel lest He consume them (33:3-6) Moses asks to see the glory (כבוד) of YHWH, which is not a visible form, but attributes of God ¹⁸⁷ (Exod 33:18, 22) The face of YHWH (פנים) will go with Israel (33:14) ¹⁸⁸ A messenger of YHWH (מלאך) will go with Israel (32:34; 33:2). ¹⁸⁹ Tent of Meeting (אהל מועד) outside camp (33:7-11), a pillar of cloud descends to the opening of the Tent (33:9-10 עמוד הענן)

¹⁸² Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 282.

¹⁸³ Blum notes the competing juxtaposition of the Priestly material in Exod 25-31//35-40 in relation to Exod 19-24; 32-34 in the matters of the priesthood, and the presence of God (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 334). Otto argues for a post-Priestly origin of Exod 32-34 and contends that Exod 32:1-6 is formed as a negative antitype to the establishment of the sanctuary, that the tent of meeting in Exod 33:7-11 corrects the Priestly theology of YHWH dwelling among Israel by placing the tent outside the camp, and that Moses' encounter with YHWH as mediator of revelation is intended as a counterpart to the mediating role of the Aaronic priesthood (Otto, "Die Nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus," 91). According to Utzschneider, Exod 28:1-51; 29:42-46 responds to the question of Aaronides raised in 32-34 (*Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 253). According to Kearney, the Priestly account accepts critique of Aaron in 32-34, and portrays the restoration and establishment of cult for Aaron's sons anyways. The new cult however is instituted with Moses' presence, supervision, and blessing (39:42-43), and ch. 40 attributes the whole construction work to Moses. P also counterbalances the tent of meeting in Exod 33:7-11 with its own conception, restoring it as the place of God's presence. Thus P encompasses Exod 32-34, suggesting that P is a supplement responding to JE in Exod 32-34 (Kearney, "Creation and Liturgy," 383-85).

¹⁸⁴ According to Propp, Exod 25-40 is focused on the mode of YHWH's presence among Israel. The Tabernacle, ark, tablets, messenger, covenant, golden calf, face of YHWH, and Moses and the priesthood all relate to this topic (*Exodus 19-40*, 619). The section can be understood as a synthesis of various theologies of presence (Hauge, *The Descent from the Mountain: Narrative Patterns in Exodus 19-40* [JSOTSup 323; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001], 171; cf. Friedhelm Hartenstein, "Das Angesicht Gottes' in Exodus 32-34," in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Exod 32-34 und Dtn 9-10* [eds. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum; VWGT 18; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001], 157-83, on the presence of God as the uniting theme in Exod 32-34).

¹⁸⁵ The כבוד and the מלאך are contrasted as representing the presence of YHWH (Hauge, *The Descent from the Mountain*, 90-91).

¹⁸⁶ The presence of the כבוד in the Tabernacle makes Sinai mobile and enables Israel to continue their journey to the promised land, which is the central concern of Exod 32-34 (Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 109).

¹⁸⁷ The כבוד here is not a visual representation of God, but is expressed in God's attributes and beneficent actions towards Israel (Childs, *Exodus*, 596; Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 349).

¹⁸⁸ On the פנים of God as "presence," see Hartenstein, "Das Angesicht Gottes' in Exodus 32-34," 157-83; Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 604; Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 74.

¹⁸⁹ As noted by Propp, YHWH sending a messenger demotes Israel to the status of other nations. Moses responds that only YHWH's presence will set Israel apart (Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 598).

Knowledge of God, distinctness of Israel	They will know (וידעו) that I am YHWH their God, who brought them out of the land of Egypt to dwell among them" (29:46) The Sabbath is a sign between Israel and YHWH, that Israel may know that YHWH sanctifies them (31:13 יהוה כי אני יהוה מקדשכם)	Moses to YHWH: If I have found favor in your sight, please make known to me your ways that I may know you in order to find favor in your sight (¹⁹⁰ הודעני נא את־דרכך ואת־עך). Consider too that this nation is your people (33:13). How shall it be known (במה יֵדַע) that I have found favor in your sight, I and your people? Is it not in your going with us, so that we are distinct, I and your people, from every other people? (33:16)
Exodus from Egypt ¹⁹¹	Exod 29:46: "They shall know that I am the Lord their God, who brought them out (יצא) of the land of Egypt that I might dwell among them. I am the Lord their God."	According to the people of Israel and YHWH, Moses is the man who brought Israel from Egypt (32:1,7,8 ;33:1 עלה); Aaron: the golden calf who brought Israel up (עלה) from Egypt (Exod 32:4); Moses: YHWH brought Israel out (32:11 יצא).
Cultic objects	ארון העדות (Exod 25:16, 21-22) ¹⁹² כפרת (Exod 25:17-22) ¹⁹³ Tent, altar, various legitimate cultic items (Exod 25-40) The people contribute building materials (35:4-9). ¹⁹⁴	לחות העדות (Exod 31:18; 32:15-19; 34:28-29) לחות האבן/אבנים (Exod 24:12; 31:18; 34:1; 34:4) עגל מסכה, molten images מסכה (Exod 32:4, 8; 34:17) The people contribute materials for the golden calf (32:2-4) Tent of meeting (33:7-11) ¹⁹⁵
Cultic Times	The Sabbath (Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3)	Agrarian Festival Calendar חג המצות (Exod 34:18): work for six days, on the seventh day rest (תשבת) חג שבועת, חג האסיף, חג הפסח (Exod 34:21, 25)

¹⁹⁰ On דרך indicating the "ways" or character of God, see Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 72.

¹⁹¹ As noted by Watts, the question of who brought Israel out of Egypt is significant in Exod 32-34, as it is referenced nine times ("Aaron and the Golden Calf in the Rhetoric of the Pentateuch," *JBL* 130 [2011]: 424). The motif reflects Israel's waning faith and memory in what YHWH has done for Israel in bringing them out of Egypt (Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 548).

¹⁹² The ark and cherubim are considered legitimate cultic items in the Priestly account (Houtman, *Exodus 20-40*, 385).

¹⁹³ Notably the כפרת as an item related to forgiveness or cleansing is not referenced in the context of covenant renewal in Exod 19-40. On the כפרת as a place of atonement, see Houtman, *Exodus 20-40*, 382.

¹⁹⁴ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 391. As noted by Moberly, there is an ironic relationship between Exod 32:1-6 and 25:1-9 (*At the Mountain of God*, 48).

¹⁹⁵ There is a debate over the function of the tent of meeting and its opening in the Priestly and non-Priestly accounts as to whether it is a place for sacrifices or prophetic word revelation (Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 294). According to 25:22, YHWH speaks to Moses from the tent, whereas in 33:11 YHWH speaks to Moses "face to face" (Hauge, *The Descent from the Mountain*, 163). There is no scholarly agreement as to whether the tent in Exod 33:7-11 reflects an ancient pre-Priestly tradition (Haran, *Temples and Temple Services*, 272-79; Pola, *Ursprüngliche Priesterschrift*, 230) or is one of the latest texts in the Pentateuch (Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 15).

Aaronic priesthood	Aaron and sons consecrated for Priesthood as a constitutive element of YHWH's care for Israel (¹⁹⁶ מלא יד Exod 28:41; 29:9, 29, 33, 35); Instructions for making the altar (27:1-7 מזבח), consecrating the altar (29:12-16)	Aaron leads illegitimate cult with idols and sacrifices and festival (Exod 32:4-5 עגל מסכה), Levites promoted as a consequence of sin and failure (מלא יד Exod 32:26-29) ¹⁹⁷
Covenant	YHWH dwelling among Israel as the culmination of the promises of Gen 17:7-8; Exod 6:2-8 in Exod 29:45-46 The Sabbath as the sign of the ברית עולם surrounding the golden calf episode and covenant renewal of Exod 32-34 (Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3).	Moses appeals to YHWH to remember the oath to the Patriarchs (זכר לאברהם ליצחק) and לישׂראל עבדיך אשר נשבעת להם בך ותדבר אלהם ארבה את־זרעכם ככוכבי השמים וכל־הארץ Exod 32:13; הזאת אשר אמרתי אתן לזרעכם ונחלו לעלם הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאברהם ליצחק; הארץ אשר נשבעתי לאמר לזרעך אתננה Exod 33:1). YHWH makes a covenant with Israel (אני ברית 34:10) to do deeds to save Israel (אעשה נפלאות); ¹⁹⁸ Israel is not to make a covenant with the inhabitants of the land (34:12, 15); Moses writes the words of the covenant on the tablets of stone, including the obligations Israel is to observe ¹⁹⁹ (34:27 על־פי הדברים האלה כרתי אתך ברית ואת־ישראל). The words of the covenant are called the ten words (34:28 על־הלחת ויקתב על־הלחת את דברי הברית עשרת הדברים).
Obedience ²⁰⁰	Moses and the People do everything according to command	Moses usurps divine initiative and authority Aaron and People act by own initiative

Traditionally most scholars presumed that Exod 32-34 represent the pre-Priestly continuation of Exod 19-24, either as part of the J or E source, Deuteronomistic texts, or independent traditions.²⁰¹ Several scholars still consider the majority of

¹⁹⁶ On מלא יד as a technical term for inauguration into priestly service, see Propp, *Exodus* 19-40, 452.

¹⁹⁷ As noted by Blum, the setting apart of the Levites as a special priesthood marks the end of the vocation of priesthood for all Israel established in Exod 19:6 and realized in 24:3-8 (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 56).

¹⁹⁸ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 53. The unusual ברית כרת without mention of a covenant partner in 34:10 has to be understood with reference to 34:27, which brackets the laws of vv.11-26 with the concluding covenant reference ואת־ישראל כרתי אתך ברית ואת־ישראל, indicating that Moses and Israel are the covenant partners (Dohmen, *Exodus* 19-40, 366).

¹⁹⁹ This includes the obligations of the *Privilegrecht* of Exod 34:11-26.

²⁰⁰ Hauge, *The Descent from the Mountain*, 64, 75.

²⁰¹ See the extensive history of research by Zenger on an earlier phase of research, including Wellhausen, Kraetschmar, Baentsch, Smend, Gressmann, Eissfeldt, Rudolph, Beer and Galling, Simpson, Hölscher, Noth, Beyerlin, Seebass, Newman, and Mowinkel (*Die Sinaitheophanie: Untersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistischen Geschichtswerk* [FZB 3; Würzburg: Echter, 1971], 207-31). Konrad Schmid's survey overviews more recent studies ("Israel am Sinai: Etappen der Forschungsgeschichte zu Exod 32-34 in seinen Kontexten," in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Exod 32-34 und Dtn 9-10* [eds. Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum; VWGT 18; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001], 9-40). As noted by Schmid, though Exod 32-34 were considered universally pre-Priestly, the source-assignment of virtually every verse in this section was contested between J, E, and a JE redactor that combined them ("Israel am Sinai," 15). Schmid concludes on the

Exod 32-34 to be pre-Priestly.²⁰² There is also an increasing tendency to view sections of Exod 32-34 as post-priestly.²⁰³ A detailed examination of the relationship of the Priestly and non-Priestly texts of Exod 32-34 is beyond the scope of this current study and is tied to questions of Pentateuchal criticism that far exceed the boundaries of Exod 32-34.²⁰⁴ For our purposes it suffices to say that the sequence of theophany and covenant (Exod 19-24*), covenant breaking with violation of the image prohibition (Exod 32*), and covenant renewal based on the *Privilegrecht* laws of Exod 34:11-26 by God (Exod 33-34*) can be considered pre-Priestly.²⁰⁵ As noted by Crüsemann, "Do

state of research, "Der gegebene Überblick zeigt zumindest dies, dass eine Beschreibung von Minimalkonsensen als Zusammenfassung ausscheiden muss - die unterschiedlichen Zugangsweisen der Forschung sind zu divergent, als dass sich aus ihnen ein handhabbarer größter gemeinsamer Nenner extrahieren ließe" ("Israel am Sinai," 33). H.C. Brichto is in the minority in seeing Exod 32-34 in its entirety as from a single narrator, with the discrepancies which give rise to literary criticism reflecting deliberate artistic literary technique ("The Worship of the Golden Calf: A Literary Analysis of a Fable of Idolatry," *HUCA* 54 [1983]: 4).

²⁰² Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 10-11, 379-80 (with some later additions); Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 333-334; Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 176-78; Van Seters, *The Life of Moses*, 245-60. According to Konkel, there are three compositional layers: a pre-Deuteronomistic golden calf narrative comprising most of Exod 32*, a second pre-Deuteronomistic stage of composition that added 33:12-17 and Exod 34:1-27*, and a finally a Deuteronomistic stage that is post-Priestly, including 24:12; 31:18; 32:4-5, 7-16, 19; 33:1-6; 34:8-11, 28-35* (*Sünde und Vergebung: Eine Rekonstruktion der Redaktionsgeschichte der hinteren Sinaiperikope [Exodus 32-34] vor dem Hintergrund aktueller Pentateuchmodelle* [FAT 58; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008], 248-49). Bernard Renaud argues for a Deuteronomistic redaction of various independent traditions of theophany, the Book of the Covenant, the golden calf narrative, and cultic regulations from Exod 34 into a pre-Priestly narrative, combined with the Priestly material by a redactor (*L'Alliance: Un mystère de miséricorde. Une lecture de Exod 32-34* [LeDiv 169; Paris: Cerf, 1998]). Vermeylen sees four stages of Deuteronomistic redaction in the pre-Priestly Sinai pericope ("L'affaire du veau d'or [Exod 32-34]. Une clé pour la 'question deutéronomiste'?" *ZAW* 97 [1985]: 21). Crüsemann sees much of Exod 32-34 as being pre-Priestly, but also considers portions of it as post-Priestly (*The Torah*, 48-54).

²⁰³ For the history of research that ascribes significant portions of Exod 32-34 as post-Priestly, see Konkel, *Sünde und Vergebung*, 21-30, 248-79; Otto, *Theologische Ethik*, 230-33. Otto argues that Exod 32-34 is a post-Priestly combination of Priestly and Deuteronomistic language that corrects the Priestly Tabernacle account ("Die Nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus," 91-99).

²⁰⁴ See Schmid, "Israel am Sinai," 9-11, 33-35 on the complexity of this question, and how many "Schwerpunkte" of Pentateuchal research are concentrated in Exod 32-34.

²⁰⁵ Zenger, "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)," 178; Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 10-12 (assigned to Albertz' K^{EX} narrative, redacted by R^{EX} before the Priestly redaction). Cf. Zenger, *Die Sinaitheophanie*, 230, on the pre-Priestly assignment of 34:28, and also Crüsemann, who argues that the story of sin and forgiveness in Exod 32-34 are pre-Deuteronomistic (*The Torah*, 52-53). According to Blum, the pre-Priestly KD account of Exod 19-34 represents a conceptionally remarkably coherent composition, despite all of its complexity and use of older traditions (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 47, 72). The connection between Exod 19-24 and 32-34 is seen from the contrast of Exod 32 with Exod 19-24, which represents an "ideological negation of all previous experiences" at the mountain in Exod 19-24, and Exod 34, which summarizes several key motifs from Exod 19-24, 32-33 (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 54, 65-66, 88-89). According to Propp, Exod 32:6

not the instructions to Moses in Exod 25-31 to build a shrine presume that their carrying out in Exod 35ff. is separated from them by the remarkable events in 32-34? We cannot really imagine a text in which instructions and their fulfillment simply follow each other without some kind of break."²⁰⁶ This assessment is supported by ancient Near Eastern parallel accounts, in which instructions for temple-building are interrupted by unfortunate events, followed by a resumption completing the building.²⁰⁷ According to Perlitt, the structure of Exod 32 and 34 shows what happens to Israel in its history of idolatry, and Exod 34:28 shows what can happen by envisioning the possibility of forgiveness and renewal based on observance of the דברי הברית on the tablets.²⁰⁸ The covenant pertains to Israel maintaining its special status among the nations. Correct worship of YHWH with monolatry, festivals, and sacrifices are of central importance for the possibility of renewal in the non-Priestly material in Exod 34.²⁰⁹ The cultic instructions in Exod 34:11-26 show that Exod 32-34 as a whole are concerned with correct worship, which the adjoining Priestly texts in Exod

particularly parodies the covenant ratification of Exod 24:5 (*Exodus 19-40*, 553). Also on the integral continuation of Exod 19-24 in 32-34 see Hauge (*The Descent from the Mountain*, 66-70) and Childs (*Exodus*, 604).

²⁰⁶ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 48; so also Utzschneider, *Heiligtum und Gesetz*, 82-86.

²⁰⁷ For example the *Samsuiluna B* inscription discussed by Hurowitz, where building instructions are disrupted by a rebellion, followed by an execution of the building (*I Have Built you an Exalted House*, 63-65).

²⁰⁸ Perlitt, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (WMANT 36; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1969), 211. Despite its use of earlier traditions, the pattern of sin and forgiveness in Exod 32 and 34 should be considered an "indissoluble narrative unity" (Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 50; Childs, *Exodus*, 560; Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 152 on R^{JE} forming this unity). As argued by Crüsemann, the theme of the tablets are significant for the unity of Exod 32-34: "The narrative unity of 32-34 requires disclosure of the contents of the tablets as well as the renewal of the destroyed tablets, and there are no literary-critical reasons that could justify the dissolution of this clear structure" (*The Torah*, 52). The tablets at 32:19 and 34:1-10 symbolize the breaking and renewal of the covenant (Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 264; Childs, *Exodus*, 608-11).

²⁰⁹ Hans-Christoph Schmitt, "Das sogenannte jahwistische Privilegrecht in Exod 34:10-28 als Komposition der spätdeuteronomistischen Endredaktion des Pentateuch," in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngeren Diskussion* (eds. J.C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte; BZAW 315; Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002), 171. Schmitt however sees the laws as a composition of the final redaction of the Pentateuch. According to Blum, the laws of 34:11-26 represent a compilation of all of the instructions Israel has received up to this point, including Exod 13; 20-23; and also related to Exod 24, as a later addition to Exod 24:3-8 (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 68-70).

25-31//35-40 interpret from the perspective of Priestly theology.²¹⁰ As Crüsemann argues, "Forgiveness expresses itself in the renewal of the tablets on which the cult desired by God was proclaimed, giving Israel a possible future with God. The cult-commandments give the stipulations for the possible presence of God in Israel."²¹¹ The *Privilegrecht* of Exod 34:11-26 is embedded in the covenant theme surrounding it in Exod 34:10, 27-28, and evinces the concern for how cultic regulations are integrated with the covenant in the covenant renewal.²¹² The absence of a covenant ceremony in Exod 34 indicates that this is not a covenant establishment ritual as in Exod 24, but rather is a renewal of the covenant of Exod 24.²¹³ In this regard, Exod 34:11-26 is characterized as a summary of the Decalogue and Book of the Covenant which were integrated with the covenant ceremony in Exod 24, and focus on specific cultic issues tailored to the context of Israel's cultic sin in Exod 32.²¹⁴ The laws of Exod 34:11-26 as embedded in the narrative context of Israel's rebellion and restoration express the understanding of law that constitute the entire Torah:

Das 'Gesetz' ist Israel gegeben - als Hilfe, um im Gottesbund, d.h. vor JHWH, leben zu können, trotz und mit aller menschlichen Schwäche.²¹⁵

²¹⁰ So Crüsemann, "The cultic instructions in Exod 34:11ff. show that, as a whole, chapters 32-34 are concerned with correct worship, and the adjoining priestly texts could connect positively or negatively. It is nevertheless doubtful whether we should interpret the priestly conception, in which all the emphasis is laid upon the establishment of true worship, as an extrapolation and interpretation of a legal document which preceded it. It is more likely that in Exod 32-34 the redactor had an older, preexilic tradition in which there was already a concern for the matter of the correct YHWH cult. The priestly document had to set everything in the presence of the holy God" (*The Torah*, 48, cf. 54, 115). As noted by Hauge, priestly interests are integral to Exod 19-40 as a whole, both in texts considered P and non-P, and the "priestly" portions in Exod 19-24, 32-34 should not be considered superficial priestly redactions (*The Descent from the Mountain*, 50n70).

²¹¹ Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 53. According to Dohmen, the relation between Exod 24:8 and 34:27 shows that Exod 34 is not the establishment of a covenant that replaces the one of Exod 24, but rather the *Privilegrecht* as a "Bundestext" reacts to the sin of Exod 32 and lays the foundations for how Israel can remain in the covenant with YHWH and how YHWH can realize His promise to dwell among Israel (*Exodus 19-40*, 372).

²¹² Ibid., 365. Moberly considers these laws the covenant stipulations (*At the Mountain of God*, 95).

²¹³ Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 365.

²¹⁴ Moberly, *At the Mountain of God*, 96; Dohmen, *Exodus 19-40*, 365.

²¹⁵ Ibid., 365.

The laws of the *Privilegrecht* are understood as the "Marken-Zeichen" establishing the identity of the people of YHWH, and thus stand in contrast to the Sabbath as the sign in Exod 31:12-17.²¹⁶ In summary, Exod 32-34 presents a paradigmatic narrative of idolatry leading to covenant failure and subsequent covenant renewal based on the laws of Exod 34:11-26.

It has frequently been noted that Exod 31:12-17//35:1-3 structure the Tabernacle account of Exod 25-31, 35-40 into a chiasm around the non-Priestly account of Exod 32-34.²¹⁷ According to Andreas Ruwe, the key to understanding this structure of Exod 25-40, with the Sabbath surrounding Exod 32-34, is the programmatic parenesis of the Holiness Code as stated in Lev 19:30; 26:2: את־שבתתי תשמרו ומקדשי תיראו אני יהוה.²¹⁸ Both the Tabernacle as the place of YHWH's indwelling among Israel as sacred space (29:43-46), and the Sabbath as sacred time (31:13) advance Israel's holiness as two sides of the same reality defining sacred time and sacred space.²¹⁹ As argued by Otto and Blum, the programmatic statement on the Tabernacle in Exod 29:43-46 is the foundation for the parenesis to holiness in the Holiness Code.²²⁰ The same significance is noted by Israel Knohl: Exod 31:12-17//35:1-3 bring the Sabbath and Tabernacle into close connection to emphasize the qualitative similarity between the Sabbath and the Temple and to exhort reverence for both by strengthening the

²¹⁶ F.-L. Hossfeld, "Das Privilegrecht Exod 34:11-26 in der Diskussion" in *Recht und Ethos im Alten Testament - Gestalt und Wirkung. Festschrift für Horst Seebass zum 65. Geburtstag* (eds. S. Beyerle, G. Mayer, and H. Strauß; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1999), 54. Cf. Dohmen on the *Privilegrecht* as "identitätsbildende Abgrenzung" (*Exodus 19-40*, 376).

²¹⁷ Utzschneider, "Tabernacle," in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation* (eds. Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr; VTSup 164; Leiden: Brill, 2014), 291; Nihan, *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*, 568; Jacob on Exod 25-31/32-34/35-40 as an intentionally connected trilogy (*Das Buch Exodus*, 996).

²¹⁸ Ruwe, 'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift,' 121-27.

²¹⁹ Childs, *Exodus*, 541; Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 692.

²²⁰ Otto, "Innerbiblische Exegese," 175; Blum, *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 299, 318.

bond between the people and the Temple.²²¹ As developed by Ruwe, the laws of the Holiness Code can be structured around the themes of sanctuary (Lev 17:1-22:33) and Sabbath (23:1-25:55), with the key parenetic statements in Lev 26:2 inculcating obedience to the Sabbath commands and reverence of the sanctuary. The same concerns for observance of the Sabbath and reverence of the sanctuary are developed in all of the texts suggested as belonging to the Priestly narrative of Exod 25-40: Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35. If Gen 1:1–2:4a is a composition of the Holiness School with its concerns for establishing the foundations for observance of the festivals and the Sabbath as holy, it follows that the links back to Gen 1:1–2:4a between creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath seen in the Priestly Tabernacle account in Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35 likewise are from the Holiness School. The Holiness School thus designed the Tabernacle pericope, integrating older Priestly traditions (Exod 25-29*), as the culmination of creation with the establishment of sacred space (מקדש Exod 25:8) and sacred time (שבת Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3) as the prerequisites for YHWH to dwell among Israel, using the terminology of the central parenesis in the Holiness Code (Lev 19:30; 26:2 את־שבתתי תשמרו ומקדשי תיראו אני יהוה 26:2). The Priestly covenant concepts developed in Exod 29:45-46; 31:12-17 continue the line of covenant texts developing from Gen 9, 17, and Exod 6:2-8, establishing the presence of YHWH among Israel as the culmination of YHWH being God for Israel, and establishing the Sabbath as the sign of the Sinai covenant relationship between Israel and YHWH. The Holiness Code's conception of covenant brackets the golden calf and covenant renewal account of Exod 32-34, which presents covenant renewal based on the laws of the *Privilegrecht* (Exod 32:11-26) that establish Israel's identity and presents its own

²²¹ Knohl, *Sanctuary of Silence*, 195-96.

interpretation of the conceptions of the presence of God and the possibility of covenant continuation. The combination of the non-Priestly and Priestly accounts produces new meanings and implications, with a thematic coherence and theological richness that transcends the original components.²²² So according to Daniel Timmer, the Sabbath rest and sanctification frames Israel's sin of the golden calf as a sign that reminds God and Israel of their eternal relationship, and especially of the quality of holiness that is a prerequisite for YHWH to dwell among Israel (Exod 31:13; 29:45).²²³ In both Exod 32-34 and the surrounding Priestly texts, the presence of God is something dangerous that may consume a sinful Israel, and thus requires special measures to maintain holiness.²²⁴ The structure of Exod 25-40 with construction commands (Exod 25-31) and execution report (Exod 35-40) with the Sabbath texts bracketing Exod 32-34 forms a pattern of creation, fall, and restoration that highlights the tension between God's presence and the sinfulness of humanity.²²⁵ This structure forms Exod 32-34 into a negative response to the instructions in 25-31, and Exod 35-40 into a positive response,²²⁶ and also creates a sense of irony: while Moses is on the mountain receiving the instructions for legitimate worship and the ordination of Aaron, Aaron is helping an impatient Israel fabricate a cult to secure God's presence in their midst, not knowing he is destined for the priesthood.²²⁷ The structure provided by the Holiness Code accepts the critique of the Aaronic priesthood from Exod 32-34

²²² Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 370-71. In this regard, Propp is incorrect to say that the Priestly account intends to supplant or replace the non-Priestly Exod 32-34.

²²³ Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 102.

²²⁴ Childs, *Exodus*, 588.

²²⁵ Kearney, "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Exod 25-40," 383; Timmer, *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath*, 32-39, 141; Cf. Blum, who speaks of a sequence of "Bund - Abfall - Wiederherstellung" (*Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*, 333). According to Propp, the implications of the Priestly Tabernacle extend back to the pessimistic view of humanity seen in the J Primeval history, according to which humans cannot be like God or approach God, with the Priestly Sabbath and Tabernacle enabling holiness and the presence of God (*Exodus 19-40*, 693).

²²⁶ Hauge, *The Descent from the Mountain*, 63; Childs, *Exodus*, 542-53.

²²⁷ Propp, *Exodus 19-40*, 153, 566.

and allows the Aaronides to continue administering the liturgy of the cult,²²⁸ but emphasizes reverence of the sanctuary and observance of the Sabbath as the means for Israel's continuing relationship with YHWH as special concerns of the Holiness Code that go beyond the covenant renewal of Exod 32-34, which was already concerned with the question of how Israel can continue in a covenant relationship with YHWH.²²⁹ The Priestly account surrounding Exod 32-34 takes up this theme and offers its own answers to the question of the continuation of the covenant relationship. The example of Exod 32-34 bracketed by Exod 25-31//35-40 presents a model of covenant renewal that coincides with the ideology of covenant in Lev 26.²³⁰ In the narrative of Exod 25-40, with the interruption in Exod 32-34, the covenant between YHWH and Israel is indissoluble. Lev 26:1-2 connects the concepts of idolatry, Sabbath, and reverence of the sanctuary to the national fate of Israel.²³¹

Lev 26:1	לֹא-תַעֲשׂוּ לָכֶם אֱלִילִם וּפְסֵל וּמִצֵּבָה לֹא-תִקְיֻמוּ לָכֶם וְאִבְנֵי מִשְׁכֵּית לֹא תִתְּנוּ בָאָרֶצְכֶם לְהִשְׁתַּחֲוֹת עֲלֶיהָ כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם
Lev 26:2	אֶת-שִׁבְבַּתִּי תִשְׁמְרוּ וּמִקְדָּשִׁי תִירָאוּ אֲנִי יְהוָה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם

Lev 26:1-2 is also a summary statement and culmination that encompasses in shorthand all of the Holiness Code legislation.²³² In the words of Milgrom, Lev 26:1-2 "forms a transitional unit that functions as both summary and prolepsis: a capsule containing the essence of God's commandments, which are determinative for the survival or destruction of Israel's national existence, the subject of the following

²²⁸ Kearney, "Creation and Liturgy," 383. The role of Aaron is more nuanced than has usually been considered in Exod 32-34. As noted by Watts, Exod 32:1-6 places responsibility more on the people than on Aaron. The account was not too damaging for the reputation of the Aaronides, since they ultimately attained power and could easily have removed the account from the canon ("Aaron and the Golden Calf in the Rhetoric of the Pentateuch," 429).

²²⁹ Albertz, *Exodus 19-40*, 11.

²³⁰ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 13-15.

²³¹ Thomas Hieke, *Leviticus 17-27* (HThKAT 6.2; Freiburg: Herder, 2015), 1060-62; Michael Hildenbrand, *Structure and Theology in the Holiness Code* (Biblical Dissertation Series 10; North Richland Hills, TX: Bibal, 2004), 296-97; Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2277-79.

²³² Hieke, *Leviticus 17-27*, 1062; Ruwe, *'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*, 98-100.

verses, 26:3-46."²³³ Lev 26:1-2 thus combines the aspects of idolatry, Sabbath, and reverence of the sanctuary as the background for the covenant of Lev 26 that are the main themes of the Holiness structuring of Exod 25-31//32-34//35-40 as well. Particularly Lev 26:34-45 links back to the Sabbath as the sign of the Sinai covenant in Exod 31:12-17; 35:1-3 and its relationship to the covenant breaking in Exod 32-34.²³⁴ According to Lev 26:34, Israel has violated the Sabbath, which is the sign of the covenant at Sinai.²³⁵ This forms an analogy to the covenant with Abraham in Gen 17: the covenant is eternal, but failure to observe the sign of the covenant results in an individual violating the covenant and being removed from the community (פרר Gen 17:14). Though Israel has broken the covenant (פרר Lev 26:15), YHWH will not break his side of the promise (לא פרר Lev 26:44). Lev 26:39-45 presents the exile as the result of Israel's breaking of the Sinai covenant, and the only offense specifically mentioned is the Sabbath (26:34, 43):

26:39	והנשארים בכם ימקו בעונם בארצת איביכם ואף בעונת אבתם אתם ימקו
26:40	והתודו את־עונם ואת־עון אבתם במעלם אשר מעל־ו־בי ואף אשר־הלכו עמי בקרי
26:41	אף־אני אלך עמם בקרי והבאתי אתם בארץ איביהם אר־אז יכנע לבבם הערל ואז ירצו את־עונם
26:42	וזכרתי את־בריתי יעקוב ואף את־בריתי יצחק ואף את־בריתי אברהם אזכר והארץ אזכר
26:43	והארץ תעזב מהם ותרחץ את־שבתתיה בהשמה מהם והם ירצו את־עונם יען וביען במשפטי מאסק ואת־חקתי געלה נפשם
26:44	ואף־גם־זאת בהיותם בארץ איביהם לא־מאסתי ולא־געלתי לכולתם להפר בריתי אתם כי אני יהוה אלהיהם
26:45	וזקרתי להם ברית ראשנים אשר הוצאתי־אתם מארץ מצרים לעיני הגוים להיות להם לאלהים אני יהוה

²³³ Milgrom, *Leviticus 23-27*, 2277.

²³⁴ Achenbach, "Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen," 59-60; Gross, "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45," 51-55.

²³⁵ Steymans, "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26," 299; Gross, "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45," 55.

As with the golden calf episode of Exod 32-34, the covenant is indissoluble, and observance of the Sabbath is the key to the continuity of the covenant as in Exod 31:12-17//35:1-3.²³⁶ All of the texts assigned to the Priestly base layer in Exodus 25-40 (Exod 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35) thus can be seen as contributing to form a paradigmatic narrative structured by the Holiness School around the golden calf and covenant renewal narrative of Exod 32-34 to teach Israel the significance of revering the sanctuary and observing the Sabbath in how it relates to the fate of the covenant from the perspective of the Holiness Code in Lev 26.

²³⁶ Albertz, *Exodus 1-18*, 13.

Chapter 7

Conclusion

This study has investigated the Priestly texts in Exodus in three steps. First, I have argued against objections to the coherence of the Priestly narrative (P^G) and the Holiness Code and shown that they are consistent in their theology, views of the promised land, covenants, profane slaughter, and Passover. There are no inconsistencies between the Priestly narrative and the Holiness Code that necessitate assigning them to different, incommensurate origins. Having established that Gen 1:1–2:4a is best understood as a "Holiness Preamble" intended to establish the foundations for observance of the Holiness Code Sabbath and festivals, I have argued that in addition to language, theology, and themes, the Priestly narratives in Exodus can be shown to function for the purpose of establishing foundations for observing the Holiness Code. I have delineated the original Priestly narrative in Exodus, largely uncontroversially following standard views in determining that 1:7, 13-14; 2:23aβ-25; 6:2-7:7*; 12:1-14, 28, 40-41; 14* in the Exodus from Egypt account and Exod 16*; 19:1-2a; 20:8-11; 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35 in the Wilderness and Tabernacle account belong to the original Priestly narrative. I have departed from usual assessments by including Exod 12:1-14 as a whole, and 31:12-17; 35:1-3 as part of this narrative, which I have justified in the exegetical analysis. Following the understanding of Gen 1:1–2:4a as best understood as a "Holiness Preamble," this analysis has confirmed that virtually all of what is identified as the original Priestly narrative in Exodus, traditionally known as P^G, is linked backwards to Gen 1:1–2:4a as the "Holiness Preamble," and forwards to the Holiness Code in Lev 17-26 in its language, themes, and particularly its function.

The Priestly Exodus account in Exod 1:7; 2:23a β -25; 6:2-7:7*; 14* is structured by the language and theology of the H text of Gen 1:1–2:4a and presents the salvation of the Israelites as connected to creation and covenant theology, as an event that establishes the identity of Israel as the people of YHWH and who thus have a responsibility of obedience to the covenant. The covenant promises of Exod 6:2-8 point forward to Lev 26 as the ultimate conclusion of the Sinai pericope. The Holiness Code is permeated by parenesis referring back to the identity of YHWH and relationship established with Israel in Exod 6:2-8 as rationales for obedience. The specific linguistic ties of the Priestly narrative in Exod 1:13-14; 6:6; 12:1-14 to the Holiness Code show these texts to be foundational for the laws of slavery and redemption in Lev 25 and the Passover and other festivals in Lev 23. The Priestly Manna-Sabbath narrative in Exod 16 serves as a didactic narrative that reveals the Sabbath to the people of Israel and illustrates the theological principles of the economical and agricultural Sabbath laws of Lev 25, inculcating trust in YHWH's provision for the Sabbath. The Priestly Tabernacle account is likewise connected to the Holiness Preamble of Gen 1:1–2:4a in its combination of Sabbath and holiness as the culmination of creation (Exod 24:15b-18a; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35). The presence of YHWH dwelling among Israel (Exod 29:45-46) provides the impetus for the call to holiness that is central to the ethics of the Holiness Code. The juxtaposition of sanctuary and Sabbath (Exod 25:8; 31:12-17//35:1-3) illustrates the central concerns of the Holiness Code to revere the sanctuary and observe the Sabbath (Lev 19:30; 26:2), by forming a paradigmatic narrative that illustrates the covenant theology of the Holiness Code (Lev 26) that frames the golden calf and covenant renewal account in Exod 32-34 with the covenant theology of the Holiness Code.

Thus the Priestly texts in Exodus 1:7, 13-14; 2:23aβ-25; 6:2-7:7*; 12:1-14, 28, 40-41; 14*; 16;* 19:1-2a; 24:15b-18a; 25:1-2, 8; 29:43-46; 31:12-17; 35:1-3; 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-35 are seen in their language, theology, and function to reflect the concerns of the Holiness Code, with actual "priestly interests" of the priesthood and cultic ritual being peripheral. The purpose of the "priestly" account of the history of Israel from Genesis-Exodus is to be understood in light of the proclamation and call to holiness in the Holiness Code addressed to all Israel. For this reason, it is justified to consider the Priestly narratives in Gen 1-Lev 26 an "H composition" that is focused on the themes of creation, covenants, Sabbath, and ethics, leaving the traditional notion of a P^G narrative obsolete.

Exodus		
H-Composition	Priestly traditions	Non-Priestly Traditions
	Exod 1:1-5: Genealogies	
Exod 1:7, 13-14: links to creation, Lev 25 slave laws		Exod 1:6, 8-2:23a Egypt and Moses traditions
Exod 2:23aβ-25: links to Genesis covenants		Exod 3-5: Call of Moses, conflict with Pharaoh
Exod 6:2-7:6: revelation of YHWH, promises of covenant	Exod 6:13-30: Genealogies of Aaron Exod 7:8-13, 19-20a, 21b-22; 8:1-3, 12-15; 9:8-12 Aaron vs. magicians wonder contest	Exod 7-11: non-Priestly plague traditions
Exod 12:1-14: H-Passover aligned with Lev 23:5 vv.15-18, 43-52 later stages of Passover/Unleavened Bread tradition from H-school		12:21-27, 29-42: non-Priestly Passover account Exod 13: Unleavened Bread

Exod 14*: H Sea Miracle, recognition of YHWH, new creation		Exod 14: Non-Priestly sea miracle
Exod 16*: Manna-Sabbath, recognition of YHWH		Exod 15: Song of the Sea Exod 16-18: Wilderness Traditions Exod 19-24: Sinai traditions
Exod 19:1-2a; 24:15-18; 25:1-2, 8; Sinai Revelation: YHWH to dwell among Israel, revere the sanctuary and keep the Sabbath		
	Exod 25:9-29:42 Tabernacle and Priestly traditions	
Exod 29:43-46: YHWH to dwell among Israel as culmination of covenants and recognition motif		
	Exod 30-31: Priestly tabernacle traditions	
Exod 31:12-17: Sabbath as sign of the Sinai covenant		
		Exod 32-34: Golden Calf and Covenant Renewal traditions
Exod 35:1-3: Sabbath command initiating execution report, bracketing Exod 32-34		
	Exod 35-40: post-H development of the Tabernacle execution report	
Exod 39:32, 43; 40:17, 33-34: Completion of Tabernacle as culmination of creation		

Bibliography

- Achenbach, Reinhard. "Das Heiligkeitgesetz und die sakralen Ordnungen des Numeribuches im Horizont der Pentateuchredaktion." Pages 145-176 in *Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense LV- The Books of Leviticus and Numbers*. Edited by T. Römer. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 215. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- _____. "Das Heiligkeitgesetz im nachpriesterschriftlichen Pentateuch. Zu einem Buch von Klaus Grünwaldt." *Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 6 (2000): 341-50.
- Albertz, Rainer. *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period*. 2 Volumes. Translated by John Bowden. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.
- _____. *Exodus 1-18*. Zürcher Bibel. Altes Testament 2.1. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2012.
- _____. *Exodus 19-40*. Zürcher Bibel. Altes Testament 2.2. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2015.
- _____. "Wilderness Material in Exodus (Exodus 15-18)." Pages 151-168 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 164. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Albertz, Rainer, and Rüdiger Schmitt. *Family and Household Religion in Ancient Israel and the Levant*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Alt, Albrecht. *Die Ursprünge des israelitischen Rechts*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1934.
- _____. "The Origins of Israelite Law." Pages 79-132 in *Essays on Old Testament History and Religion*. Translated by R.A. Wilson. Oxford: Blackwell, 1966.
- Alt, Albrecht, Otto Eißfeldt, Paul Kahle, and Rudolf Kittel, editors. *Biblica Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 1977.
- Amit, Yairah. "הבריאה ולוח הקדושה." Pages 13-29 in *Tehillah le-Moshe: Biblical and Judaic Studies in Honor of Moshe Greenberg*. Edited by Mordechai Cogan, Barry L. Eichler, and Jeffrey Tigay. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1997.
- Arnold, Bill T. *Genesis*. New Cambridge Bible Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- _____. "Genesis 1 as Holiness Preamble." Pages 332-44 in *Let Us Go Up to Zion: Essays in Honour of H. G. M. Williamson on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*. Edited by Ian Provan and Mark J. Boda. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 153. Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- _____. "The Holiness Redaction of the Flood Narrative (Genesis 6:9-9:29)." Pages 13-41 in *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold, Nancy Erickson, and John Walton. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- Baden, Joel. *The Composition of the Pentateuch: Renewing the Documentary Hypothesis*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.
- _____. *J, E, and the Redaction of the Pentateuch*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 68. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- _____. "The Original Place of the Priestly Manna Story in Exodus 16." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 122 (2010): 491-504.
- Baentsch, Bruno. *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Lev. XVII-XXVI: Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung*. Erfurt: Güther, 1893.

- _____. *Exodus-Leviticus*. Handkommentar zum Alten Testament 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1903.
- Bakon, Shimon. "Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath." *Jewish Bible Quarterly* 25.2 [1997]: 79-85.
- Bauks, Michaela. "Die Begriffe מורשה und ארצה in P^G: Überlegungen zur Landkonzeption in der Priestergrundschrift." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 116 (2004): 171-188.
- Berner, Christophe. *Die Exoduserzählung: Das literarische Werden einer Ursprungslegende Israels*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 73. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010.
- _____. "Die Literarische Character der Priesterschrift in der Exoduserzählung (Exod 1-14)." Pages 94-133 in *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte*. Edited by Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 40. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015.
- Bertholet, Alfred. *Leviticus Erklärt*. Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament III. Tübingen & Leipzig: J.C.B. Mohr, 1901.
- Blenkinsopp, Joseph. *The Pentateuch: An Introduction to the First Five Books of the Bible*. Anchor Bible Reference Library. New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- _____. "The Structure of P." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 38 (1976): 275-292.
- Blum, Erhard. *Die Komposition der Vätergeschichte*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 57. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1984.
- _____. *Studien zur Komposition des Pentateuch*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 189. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1990.
- _____. "The Decalogue and the Composition History of the Pentateuch." Pages 289-301 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- _____. "Issues and Problems in the Contemporary Debate Regarding the Priestly Writings." Pages 31-44 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel Baden. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- Brett, Mark. "The Priestly Dissemination of Abraham." *Hebrew Bible and Ancient Israel* 3 (2014): 87-107.
- Brichto, Herbert Chanan. "The Worship of the Golden Calf: A Literary Analysis of a Fable of Idolatry." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 54 (1983): 1-44.
- Brown, William P. *The Ethos of the Cosmos: The Genesis of Moral Imagination in the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999.
- Carmichael, Calum. *Illuminating Leviticus: A Study of its Laws and Institutions in Light of Biblical Narratives*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006.
- Carr, David. *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- _____. "Method in Determination of Direction of Dependence: An Empirical Test of Criteria Applied to Exodus 34:11-26 and Its Parallels." Pages 107-140 in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Exod 32-34 und Dtn 9-10*. Edited by Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 18. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001.

- _____. *Reading the Fractures of Genesis*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Chavel, Simeon. *Oracular Law and Priestly Historiography in the Torah*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II.71. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Cholewinski, Alfred. *Heiligkeitgesetz und Deuteronomium*. Analecta Biblica 66. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1976.
- Cook, John. *Time and the Biblical Hebrew Verb: The Expression of Tense, Aspect, and Modality in Biblical Hebrew*. Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 7. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2012.
- Cooper, Alan, and Bernard Goldstein. "The Development of the Priestly Calendars (I): The Daily Sacrifice and the Sabbath." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 74 [2003]: 1-20.
- Cross, Frank Moore. *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971.
- _____. "The Priestly Tabernacle in the Light of Recent Research." Pages 169-180 in *Temples and High Places in Biblical Times*. Edited by Avraham Biran. Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College Press, 1981.
- Crüsemann, Frank. "Der Exodus als Heiligung: zur rechtsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung des Heiligkeitgesetzes." Pages 117-129 in *Die Hebräische Bibel und ihre zweifache Nachgeschichte: Festschrift für Rolf Rendtorff zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erhard Blum, Christian Macholz, and Ekkehard Stegemann. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1990.
- _____. *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*. Translated by Allan W. Mahnke. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1996.
- Diesel, Anja. *"Ich bin Jahwe": Der Aufstieg der Ich-bin-Jahwe-Aussage zum Schlüsselwort des alttestamentlichen Monotheismus*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 110. Neukirchener-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 2006.
- Dillmann, August. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium, und Josua*. 2nd edition. Kurzgefasstes Exegetische Handbuch. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1886.
- Dillmann, August, and Victor Ryssel. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. 3rd edition. Kurzgefasstes Exegetische Handbuch. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1897.
- Dohmen, Christoph. *Exodus 1-18*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2015.
- _____. *Exodus 19-40*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2004.
- _____. "Der Sinaibund als Neuer Bund nach Exod 19-34." Pages 51-83 in *Der Neue Bund im Alten: Zur Bundestheologie der beiden Testamente*. Edited by Erich Zenger. Quaestiones Disputatae 146. Freiburg: Herder, 1993.
- Dozeman, Thomas. *Exodus*. Eerdmans Critical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- Dozeman, Thomas, and Konrad Schmid, editors. *A Farewell to the Yahwist?: The Composition of the Pentateuch in Recent European Interpretation*. SBL Symposium Series 34. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Durham, John. *Exodus*. Word Biblical Commentary 3. Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 1987.
- Eerdmans, Bernardus. *Alttestamentliche Studien IV: Das Buch Leviticus*. Giessen: Töpelmann, 1912.

- Elliger, Karl. "Heiligkeitgesetz." Pages 175-176 in vol. 3 of *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*. Edited by Kurt Galling. 7 volumes. 3rd Edition. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1957-65.
- _____. *Leviticus*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 4. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1966.
- _____. "Sinn und Ursprung der priesterlichen Geschichtserzählung." *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 49 (1952): 121-143.
- Elliott-Binns, L.E. "Some Problems of the Holiness Code." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 67 (1955): 26-40.
- Ellman, Barat. *Memory and Covenant: The Role of Israel's and God's Memory in Sustaining the Deuteronomic and Priestly Covenants*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2013.
- Ewald, Heinrich. *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Volume 1. 3rd edition. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1864.
- _____. *The History of Israel*. Translated by R. Martineau. 2nd edition. London: Longmans, Green, & co., 1869.
- Firmage, Edwin. "Genesis 1 and the Priestly Agenda." *Journal for the Study of the Old Testament* 82 (1999): 110.
- Frevel, Christian. *Mit Blick auf das Land die Schöpfung Erinnern: Zum Ende der Priestergrundschrift*. Herders Biblische Studien 23. Freiburg: Herder, 2000.
- Fritz, Volkmar. *Tempel und Zelt: Studien zum Tempelbau in Israel und zu dem Zeltheiligtum der Priesterschrift*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 47. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1977.
- Feucht, Christian. *Untersuchungen zum Heiligkeitgesetz*. Theologische Arbeiten 20. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- Fischer, Georg. "A Need for Hope? A Comparison between the Dynamics in Leviticus 26 and Deuteronomy 28-30*." Pages 369-388 in *Current Issues in Priestly and Related Literature: The Legacy of Jacob Milgrom and Beyond*. Edited by Roy E. Gane and Ada Taggar-Cohen. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2015.
- _____. "Exodus 1-15: Eine Erzählung." Pages 149-178 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction-Reception-Interpretation*. Edited by Marc Vervenne. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 126. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- Fischer, Georg, and Dominik Markl. *Exodus*. Neue Stuttgarter Kommentare zum Alten Testament 2. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 2009.
- Fox, Michael V. "The Sign of the Covenant: Circumcision in Light of the Priestly 'ôt Etiologies." *Revue Biblique* 81 (1974): 557-596.
- Fretheim, Terence. *Exodus*. Interpretation Bible Commentary. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- _____. *God and World in the Old Testament: A Relational Theology of Creation*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 2005.
- Gaines, Jason. *The Poetic Priestly Source*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2015.
- George, Mark. *Israel's Tabernacle as Social Space*. Society of Biblical Literature Ancient Israelite Literature 2. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2009.

- Gerstenberger, Erhard. *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Old Testament Library. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996.
- Gertz, Jan Christian. *Tradition und Redaktion in der Exoduserzählung: Untersuchungen zur Endredaktion des Pentateuch*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 186. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2000.
- Gesenius, Wilhelm. *Gesenius' Hebrew Grammar*. Edited by E. Kautsch. Translated by A.E. Cowley. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1910.
- Gesundheit, Simon. *Three Times a Year: Studies on Festival Legislation in the Pentateuch*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 82. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Gilders, William. "Sacrifice before Sinai and the Priestly Narratives." Pages 57-72 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- Görg, Manfred. *Das Zelt der Begegnung: Untersuchung zur Gestalt der sakralen Zeltraditionen Altisraels*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 27. Bonn: Hanstein, 1967.
- Greifenhagen, Franz. *Egypt on the Pentateuch's Ideological Map: Constructing Biblical Israel's Identity*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 361. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.
- Guillaume, Philippe. *Land and Calendar: The Priestly Document from Genesis 1 to Joshua 18*. Library of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament 391. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Graf, Karl Heinrich. *Die Geschichtlichen Bücher des Alten Testaments: Zwei historisch-kritischen Untersuchungen*. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1866.
- Greenberg, Moshe. *Understanding Exodus: A Holistic Commentary on Exodus 1-11*. 2nd edition. Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2013.
- Gross, Walter. "'Rezeption' in Exod 31:12-17 und Lev 26:39-45: Sprachliche Form und theologisch-konzeptionelle Leistung." Pages 45-64 in *Rezeption und Auslegung im Alten Testament und seinem Umfeld: Ein Symposium aus Anlass des 60. Geburtstags von Old Hannes Steck*. Edited by R.G.Kratz and Thomas Krüger. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 153. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1997.
- Grünwaldt, Klaus. *Exil und Identität: Beschneidung, Passa, und Sabbat in der Priesterschrift*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 85. Frankfurt: Hain, 1992.
- _____. *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Leviticus 17-26: Ursprüngliche Gestalt, Tradition, und Theologie*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 271. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1999.
- Haran, Menahem. *Temples and Temple Service in Ancient Israel: An Inquiry into Biblical Cult Phenomena and the Historical Setting of the Priestly School*. 2nd Edition. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1985.
- Hartenstein, Friedhelm, and Konrad Schmid, editors. *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte*. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 40. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015.
- _____. "Das Angesicht Gottes' in Exodus 32-34." Pages 157-183 in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Exod 32-34 und Dtn 9-10*. Edited by Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 18. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001.
- Hartley, John. *Leviticus*. Word Biblical Commentary 4. Dallas: Word Books, 1992.

- Hauge, Martin Ravndal. *The Descent from the Mountain: Narrative Patterns in Exodus 19-40. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 323*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001.
- Hepner, Gershom. *Legal Friction: Law, Narrative, and Identity Politics in Biblical Israel*. New York: Peter Lang, 2010.
- Hieke, Thomas. *Leviticus 17-27*. Herders Theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament. Freiburg: Herder, 2015.
- Hildenbrand, Michael. *Structure and Theology in the Holiness Code*. Bibal Dissertation Series 10. North Richland Hills, TX: Bibal, 2004.
- Hoffmann, David. *Das Buch Leviticus*. 2 Volumes. Berlin: M. Poppelauer, 1906.
- Holzinger, Heinrich. *Einleitung in die Hexateuch*. Freiburg: J.C.B. Mohr, 1893.
- _____. *Exodus*. Kurzer Hand-commentar zum Alten Testament 2. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1900.
- Horst, Louis. *Leviticus XVII-XXVI und Hezekiel: eine Beitrag zur Pentateuchkritik*. Colmar: Barth, 1881.
- Hossfeld, Franz-Lothar. *Der Dekalog: Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 45. Fribourg&Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1982.
- _____. "Das Privilegrecht Exod 34:11-26 in der Diskussion." Pages 39-59 in *Recht und Ethos im Alten Testament - Gestalt und Wirkung. Festschrift für Horst Seebass zum 65. Geburtstag* Edited by S. Beyerle, G. Mayer, and H. Strauß. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener Verlag, 1999.
- Hundley, Michael. "Sacred Spaces, Objects, Offerings, and People in the Priestly Texts: A Reappraisal." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 132.4 (2013): 749-67.
- Hupfeld, Heinrich. *Die Quellen der Genesis und die Art ihrer Zusammensetzung*. Berlin: Wiegandt und Grieben, 1853.
- Hurowitz, Victor. "The Priestly Account of the Tabernacle." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105.1 (1985): 21-30.
- _____. *I Have Built You an Exalted House: Temple Building in the Bible in Light of Mesopotamian and Northwest Semitic Writings*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplements 115. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.
- Ilgen, Karl David. *Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs in ihrer Urgestalt, als Beytrag zur Berichtigung der Geschichte der Religion und Politik aus dem Hebräischen mit kritischen und erklärenden Anmerkungen, auch mancherley dazu gehörenden Abhandlungen, vol. 1: Die Urkunden der ersten Buchs von Moses*. Halle: Hemmerde and Schwetschke, 1798.
- Jacob, Benno. *The Second Book of the Bible: Exodus*. Translated by Walter Jacob. Hoboken, NJ: Ktav, 1992.
- Janowski, Bernd. *Sühne als Heilsgeschehen: Traditions- und religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Sühnetheologie der Priesterschrift*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 55. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1983.
- _____. "Tempel und Schöpfung: Schöpfungstheologische Aspekte der priesterschriftlichen Heiligtumskonzeption." Pages 214-246 in *Gottes Gegenwart in Israel: Beiträge zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1993.

- _____. "Was sich Wiederholt: zu einem vernachlässigten Aspekt des alttestamentlichen Zeitverständnisses." Pages 315-335 in *"Ich werde meinen Bund mit euch niemals brechen!" (Ri 2,1): Festschrift für Walter Gross zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Erasmus Gass and Hermann-Josef Stipp. Herder Biblische Studien 62. Freiburg: Herder, 2011.
- Jenni, Ernst. *Die theologische Begründung des Sabbatgebotes*. Zollikon-Zürich: Evangelischer Verlag, 1956.
- Jenson, Robert. *Graded Holiness: A Key to the Priestly Conception of the World*. Library of the Hebrew Bible/Old Testament 106. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1992.
- Jeon, Jaeyoung. *The Call of Moses and the Exodus Story*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II/60. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Joosten, Jan. "Covenant Theology in the Holiness Code," *Zeitschrift für altorientalische und biblische Rechtsgeschichte* 4 (1998): 145-164.
- _____. *People and Land in the Holiness Code: An Exegetical Study of the Ideational Framework of the Law in Leviticus 17-26*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 67. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Kaufman, Stephen. "The Temple Scroll and Higher Criticism." *Hebrew Union College Annual* 53 (1983): 29-43.
- Kearney, Peter. "Creation and Liturgy: The P Redaction of Exod 25-40." *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 89 (1977): 375-87.
- Kilchör, Benjamin. *Mosetora und Jahwetora: Das Verhältnis Von Deuteronomium 12-26 zu Exodus, Levitikus, und Numeri*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte 21. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2015.
- _____. "Passah und Mazzot - Ein Überblick über die Forschung seit dem 19. Jahrhundert." *Biblica* 94 (2013): 340-67.
- Kilian, Rudolf. *Literarkritische und Formgeschichtliche untersuchung des Heiligkeitgesetzes*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 19. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1963.
- King, Thomas. *The Realignment of the Priestly Literature: The Priestly Narrative in Genesis and its Relation to Priestly Legislation and the Holiness School*. Eugene, Or.: Pickwick, 2009.
- Klein, Gottlieb. "Die Totaphot nach Bibel und Tradition." *Jahrbuch für Protestantische Theologie VII* (1881): 666-89.
- Klostermann, August. "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz." *Zeitschrift für die gesamte lutherische Theologie und Kirche* 38 (1877): 401-445.
- _____. "Ezechiel und das Heiligkeitgesetz." Pages 368-418 in *Der Pentateuch: Beiträge zu seinem Verständnis und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte*. Leipzig: Böhne, 1893.
- Knauf, Ernst Axel. "Der Exodus zwischen Mythos und Geschichte: Zur priesterschriftlichen Rezeption der Schilfmeer-Geschichte in Exod 14." Pages 73-84 in *Schriftauslegung in der Schrift: Festschrift für Odil Hannes Steck zu seinem 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Reinhard Kratz, Thomas Krüger, and Konrad Schmid. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 300. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2000.
- Knobel, August. *Die Bücher Exodus und Leviticus*. 2nd edition. Updated by A. Dillmann. Kurzer Exegetische Handbuch zum Alten Testaments 12. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1880.
- _____. *Die Bücher Numeri, Deuteronomium und Josua erklärt. Nebst einer Kritik des Pentateuch und Josua*. Kurzer Exegetische Handbuch zum Alten Testaments 13. Leipzig: Hirzel, 1861.

- Knohl, Israel. *The Sanctuary of Silence*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 1995.
- _____. "Who Edited the Pentateuch?" Pages 359-67 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by T. Dozeman, K. Schmid, and B. Schwartz. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Koch, Klaus. *Die Priesterschrift von Exod. 25 bis Lev 16. Eine überlieferungsgeschichtliche und literarkritische Untersuchung*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 71. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1959.
- Köckert, Matthias. *Leben im Gottes Gegenwart: Studien zum Verständnis des Gesetzes im Alten Testament*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004.
- Kohata, Fujiko. *Jahwist und Priesterschrift in Exodus 3-14*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 166. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1986.
- Konkel, Michael. *Sünde und Vergebung: Eine Rekonstruktion der Redaktionsgeschichte der hinteren Sinaiperikope (Exodus 32-34) vor dem Hintergrund aktueller Pentateuchmodelle*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 58. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Kornfeld, Walter. *Studien zum Heiligkeitgesetz*. Vienna: Herder, 1952.
- Korpel, Marjo. "The Epilogue to the Holiness Code." Pages 123-50 in *Verse in Ancient Near Eastern Prose*. Edited by J.C. de Moor and W.G.E. Watson. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 42. Kevelaer: Verlag Butzon and Bercker; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1993.
- Kratz, Reinhard. *The Composition of the Narrative Books of the Old Testament*. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Krüger, Thomas. "Genesis 1:1-2:3 and the Development of the Pentateuch." Pages 125-38 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas B. Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch J. Schwartz. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- Küchler, Siegfried. *Das Heiligkeitgesetz Lev 17-26: Eine literarkritische Untersuchung*. Königsberg: Kümmel, 1929.
- Kuenen, Abraham. *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek naar het ontstaan en de verzameling van de Boeken des Ouden Verbonds*. 3 Volumes. Leiden: Engels, 1861-65.
- _____. *An Historico-Critical Inquiry into the Origin and Composition of the Hexateuch*. 3 Volumes. Translated by P. Wicksteed. London: MacMillan, 1886.
- Laaf, Peter. *Die Pascha-Feier Israels*. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 36. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1970.
- Leonhard, Clemens. "Die Erzählung Exod 12 als Festlegende für das Pesachfest am Jerusalemer Tempel." *Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie* 18 (2003): 233-260.
- Levenson, Jon D. *Creation and the Persistence of Evil: The Jewish Drama of Divine Omnipotence*. San Francisco: Harper&Row, 1988.
- Levin, Christoph. *Der Jahwist*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 157. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1993.
- Loewenstamm, Samuel. *The Evolution of the Exodus Tradition*. Jerusalem: Magnes Press, 1992.
- Lohfink, Norbert. "Die Abänderung der Theologie des priesterlichen Geschichtswerks im Segen des Heiligkeitgesetzes: Zu Lev 26,9, 11-13." Pages 129-136 in *Wort und Geschichte: Festschrift für Karl Elliger zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by H. Gese and H. Rüger. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 18. Kevelaer: Butzon&Berker, 1973.

- _____. "The Priestly Narrative and History." Pages 136-172 in *Theology of the Pentateuch: Themes of the Priestly Narrative and Deuteronomy*. Translated by Linda M. Maloney. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1994.
- Löhr, Max. *Untersuchungen zum Hexateuchproblem I: Der Priesterkodex in der Genesis*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische Wissenschaft 38. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1924.
- Macholz, Christian. *Israel und das Land*. Habilitationsschrift. Heidelberg, 1969.
- Marcos, Natalie Fernandez. *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible*. Translated by Wilfred Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- McEvenue, Sean. *The Narrative Style of the Priestly Writer*. Analecta Biblica 50. Rome: Biblical Institute, 1971.
- Milgrom, Jacob. *Leviticus*. 3 Volumes. New York: Doubleday, 1998-2001.
- _____. "H_R in Leviticus and Elsewhere in the Torah." Pages 24-40 in *The Book of Leviticus: Composition and Reception*. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 93. Edited by Rolf Rendtorff and Robert Kugler. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Moberly, Walter. *At the Mountain of God: Story and Theology in Exodus 32-34*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 22. Sheffield: University of Sheffield Press, 1983.
- Müller, Reinhard. "The Sanctifying Divine Voice: Observations on the 'anî-Yhwh-formula in the Holiness Code." Pages 76-81 in *Text, Time, and Temple: Literary, Historical, and Ritual Studies in Leviticus*. Edited by Francis Landy, Leigh M. Trevaskis, and Bryan Bibb. Sheffield: Phoenix Press, 2015.
- Müllner, Ilse. "Celebration and Narration: Metaleptic Features in Exod 12:1-13:16." Pages 25-38 in *Narratology, Hermeneutics, and Midrash: Jewish, Christian, and Muslim Narratives from the Late Antiquity through to Modern Times*. Edited by Constanza Cordoni and Gerhard Langer. Vienna: Vienna University Press, 2014.
- Negretti, Nicola. *Il Settimo Giorno: Indagine critico-teologica delle tradizioni presacerdotali e sacerdotali circa il sabato biblico*. Analecta Biblica 55. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1973.
- Nihan, Christophe. *From Priestly Torah to Pentateuch*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 25. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Nöldeke, Theodore. *Untersuchungen zur Kritik des Alten Testaments*. Kiel: Schwes, 1869.
- Noth, Martin. *Das Buch Josua*. Handbuch zum Alten Testament 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1938.
- _____. *The Deuteronomistic History*. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 15. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981.
- _____. *A History of Pentateuchal Traditions*. Translated by Bernard Anderson. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1972.
- _____. *Überlieferungsgeschichte des Pentateuch*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1948.
- _____. *Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Studien*. 2nd edition. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer, 1957.
- Olyan, Saul. "Exodus 31:12-17: The Sabbath According to H, or the Sabbath According to P and H?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 201-209.
- _____. *Rites and Rank: Hierarchy in Biblical Representations of the Cult*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2000.
- Oswald, Wolfgang. "Die Exodus-Gottesberg-Erzählung als Gründungsurkunde der jüdischen

- Bürgergemeinde." Pages 35-51 in *Law and Narrative in the Bible and in the Neighboring Ancient Cultures*. Edited by Klaus-Peter Adam, Friedrich Avemarie, and Nili Wazana. Forschungen zum Alten Testament II.54. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Oswald, Wolfgang, and Helmut Utzschneider. *Exodus 1-15*. International Exegetical Commentary on the Old Testament. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2014.
- Otto, Eckart. "Forschungen zur Priesterschrift." *Theologische Rundschau* 62 (1997): 1-50.
- _____. "The Holiness Code in Diachrony and Synchrony in the Legal Hermeneutics of the Pentateuch." Pages 135-156 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Schectman and Joel S. Baden; Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- _____. "Innerbiblische Exegese im Heiligkeitgesetz Levitikus 17-26." Pages 125-196 in *Levitikus als Buch*. Edited by H-J. Fabry and H-W. Jüngling. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 119. Berlin: Philo, 1999.
- _____. "Nachpriesterschriftliche Pentateuchredaktion im Buch Exodus." Pages 61-111 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction, Reception, Interpretation*. Edited by Mark Vervenne. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 126. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- _____. "פסח *pāsaḥ*." Pages 659-683 in vol. 6 of *Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament*. Edited by G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren. 6 Volumes. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1970.
- _____. "Priesterschrift und Deuteronomium im Buch Levitikus: Zur Integration des Deuteronomiums in den Pentateuch." Pages 161-185 in *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte*. Edited by Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 40. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015.
- _____. *Theologische Ethik des Alten Testaments*. Theologische Wissenschaft 3/2. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1994.
- Owczarek, Susanne. *Die Vorstellung vom Wohnen Gottes inmitten seines Volkes in der Priesterschrift*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1998.
- Perlitt, Lothar. *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 36. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1969.
- _____. "Priesterschrift im Deuteronomium?" *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 100.3 (1988): 65-88.
- Pola, Thomas. *Die ursprüngliche Priesterschrift: Beobachtungen zur Literarkritik und Traditionsgeschichte von P^G*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 70. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1995.
- Popper, Julius. *Der biblische Bericht über die Stiftshütte*. Leipzig: Heinrich Hunger, 1862.
- Propp, William. *Exodus*. 2 Volumes. Anchor Bible. New York: Doubleday, 1999-2006.
- de Pury, Albert. "Pg as the Absolute Beginning." Pages 99-128 in *Les Dernières Rédactions du Pentateuque, de L'Hexateuque, et de L'Ennéateuque*. Edited by T. Römer and K. Schmid. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 203. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2007.
- Rabast, Karlheinz. *Das apodiktische Recht im Deuteronomium und im Heiligkeitgesetz*. Berlin: Heimatdienstverlag, 1949.

- von Rad, Gerhard. *Deuteronomium-Studien*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 58. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1947.
- _____. *Die Priesterschrift im Hexateuch literarisch und theologisch gewertet*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1934.
- _____. *Studies in Deuteronomy*. Studies in Biblical Theology 9. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. London: SCM Press, 1953.
- Reindl, Joseph. "Der Finger Gottes und die Macht der Götter: Ein Problem des ägyptischen Diasporajudentums und sein literarischer Niederschlag." Pages 49-60 in *Dienst der Vermittlung: Festschrift zum 25-jährigen Bestehen des Priesterseminars Erfurt*. Edited by Wilhelm Ernst, Konrad Feiereis, and Fritz Hoffmann. Erfurter theologische Studien 37. Leipzig: St. Benno, 1977.
- Renaud, Bernard. *L'Alliance: Un mystère de miséricorde. Une lecture de Exod 32-34*. LeDiv 169. Paris: Cerf, 1998.
- Rendtorff, Rolf. "Is it possible to read Leviticus as a separate book?" Pages 22-32 in *Reading Leviticus: A Conversation with Mary Douglas*. Edited by John Sawyer. Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement 227. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- _____. *The Old Testament: An Introduction*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1986.
- Reventlow, Henning Graf. *Das Heiligkeitgesetz: formgeschichtlich untersucht*. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 6. Neukirchen: Neukirchener Verlag, 1961.
- Römer, Thomas. "The Exodus Narrative According to the Priestly Document." Pages 157-174 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by Sarah Shectman and Joel Baden. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- _____. "Von Moses Berufung zur Spaltung des Meers: Überlegungen zur priesterschriftlichen Version der Exoduserzählung." Pages 134-160 in *Abschied von der Priesterschrift? Zum Stand der Pentateuchdebatte*. Edited by Friedhelm Hartenstein and Konrad Schmid. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 40. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2015.
- _____. "Zwischen Urkunden, Fragmenten, und Ergänzungen: Zum Stand der Pentateuchforschung." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 125 (2013): 2-24.
- Rose, Martin. *Deuteronomist und Jahwist: Untersuchungen zu den Berührungspunkten beider Literaturwerke*. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 67. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1981.
- Roskop-Erisman, Angela. "Mythologizing Exile: Life, Law, and Justice after the Flood." Pages 95-110 in *Windows to the Ancient World of the Hebrew Bible: Essays in Honor of Samuel Greengus*. Edited by Bill T. Arnold, Nancy Erickson, and John Walton. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2014.
- Ruprecht, Eberhard. "Stellung und Bedeutung der Erzählung vom Mannawunder (Exod 16) im Aufbau der Priesterschrift." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 269-307.
- Ruwe, Andreas. *'Heiligkeitgesetz' und 'Priesterschrift'*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- Schäfer, Peter. "Tempel und Schöpfung: Zur Interpretation einiger Heiligtumstraditionen in der rabbinischen Literatur." *Kairos* 16 (1974): 122-133.
- Schart, Aaron. *Mose und Israel im Konflikt: Eine Redaktionsgeschichtliche studie zu den*

- Wüstenerzählungen. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 98. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag, 1990.
- Schüle, Andreas. "The 'Eternal Covenant.' in the Priestly Pentateuch and the Major Prophets." Pages 41-58 in *Covenant in the Persian Period*. Edited by Richard J. Bautch and Gary N. Knoppers. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2015.
- Schmid, Konrad. *Genesis and the Moses Story*. Siphrut 3. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2010.
- _____. "Israel am Sinai: Etappen der Forschungsgeschichte zu Exod 32-34 in seinen Kontexten." Pages 9-10 in *Gottes Volk am Sinai: Untersuchungen zu Exod 32-34 und Dtn 9-10*. Edited by Matthias Köckert and Erhard Blum. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 18. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2001.
- Schmidt, Ludwig. *Studien zur Priesterschrift*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 214. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1993.
- Schmidt, Werner. *Exodus*. Biblische Kommentar Altes Testament 2. 3 Volumes. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1977-1988.
- _____. *Die Schöpfungsgeschichte der Priesterschrift: Zur Überlieferungsgeschichte von Genesis 1:1–2:4a und 2:4b–3:24*. 2nd edition. Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament 17. Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1967.
- Schmitt, Hans-Christoph. "Das sogenannte jahwistische Privilegrecht in Exod 34:10-28 als Komposition der spätdeuteronomistischen Endredaktion des Pentateuch." Pages 157-171 in *Abschied vom Jahwisten: Die Komposition des Hexateuch in der jüngeren Diskussion*. Edited by J.C. Gertz, K. Schmid, and M. Witte. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 315. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2002.
- Schmitt, Rainer. *Exodus und Passa: Ihr Zusammenhang im Alten Testament*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1975.
- _____. *Zelt und Lade als Thema alttestamentlicher Wissenschaft*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1972.
- Schnutenhaus, F. "Das Kommen und Erscheinen Gottes im Alten Testament." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 36 (1964): 1-22.
- Schreiner, J. "Exodus 12:21-23 und das israelitische Pascha." Pages 69-90 in *Studien zum Pentateuch: Festschrift für W. Kornfeld*. Edited by G. Braulik. Vienna: Herder, 1977.
- Schwartz, Baruch. "Introduction: The Strata of the Priestly Writings and the Revised Relative Dating of P and H." Pages 1-12 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by S. Schectman and J. Baden. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- _____. *Leviticus*. Pages 203-280 in *The Jewish Study Bible*. Edited by Adele Berlin and Mark Brettler. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Seebaß, Horst. "Josua." *Biblische Notizen* 28 (1985): 56-61.
- Ska, Jean-Louis. *Introduction to Reading the Pentateuch*. Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns, 2006.
- _____. *La Passage de la Mer. Étude de la construction, du style et de la symbolique d'Exod 14:1-31*. Analecta Biblica 109. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
- _____. "Quelques remarques sur P^G et la dernière rédaction du Pentateuque." Pages 95-125 in *Le Pentateuque en question: Les origines et la composition des cinq premiers livres de la Bible à la lumière des recherches récentes*. Edited by A. de Pury. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1989.

- Smith, Mark S. "The Literary Arrangement of the Priestly Redaction of Exodus: A Preliminary Investigation." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 58 (1996): 25-50.
- _____. *The Priestly Vision of Genesis 1*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2010.
- Stackert, Jeffrey. "Compositional Strata in the Priestly Sabbath: Exodus 31:12-17 and 35:1-3." *Journal of Hebrew Scriptures* 11 (2011): 2-21.
- _____. "Distinguishing Innerbiblical Exegesis from Pentateuchal Redaction: Leviticus 26 as a Test Case." Pages 369-381 in *The Pentateuch: International Perspectives on Current Research*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Konrad Schmid, and Baruch Schwartz. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- _____. "The Holiness Legislation and its Pentateuchal Sources: Revision, Supplement, and Replacement." Pages 187-204 in *The Strata of the Priestly Writings: Contemporary Debate and Future Directions*. Edited by S. Schectman and J. Baden. Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments 95. Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 2009.
- _____. *Rewriting the Torah: Literary Revision in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Legislation*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Steck, Odil Hannes. *Der Schöpfungsbericht der Priesterschrift: Studien zur literarkritischen und überlieferungsgeschichtlichen Problematik von Genesis 1:1–2:4a*. 2nd edition. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 186. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1981.
- Steins, Georg. "Sie sollen mir ein Heiligtum machen: Zur Struktur und Entstehung von Exod 24:12-31:18." Pages 145-167 in *Vom Sinai zum Horeb: Stationen alttestamentlicher Glaubengeschichte*. Edited by F.-L. Hossfeld. Würzburg: Echter, 1989.
- Steymans, Hans-Ulrich. "Verheissung und Drohung: Lev 26." Pages 263-307 in *Leviticus als Buch*. Edited by H.-J. Fabry and H.-W. Jüngling. Bonner Biblische Beiträge 119. Berlin: Philo, 1999.
- Sun, Henry T. "An Investigation into the Compositional Integrity of the So-Called Holiness Code (Leviticus 17-27)." Ph.D Dissertation. Claremont Graduate University, 1990.
- Taggar-Cohen, Ada. "Violence at the Birth of Religion in Exod 19-40." *Journal of the Interdisciplinary Study of Monotheistic Religions* 1 (2005): 101-116.
- Thiel, Winfried. "Erwägungen zum alter des Heiligkeitsetz." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft* 81 (1969): 40-73.
- Timmer, Daniel. *Creation, Tabernacle, and Sabbath: The Sabbath Frame of Exodus 31:12-17; 35:1-3 in Exegetical and Theological Perspective*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 227. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2009.
- Utzschneider, Helmut. *Das Heiligtum und das Gesetz: Studien zur Bedeutung der sinaitischen Heiligtumstexte (Exod 25-40; Lev 8-9)*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 77. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 1988.
- _____. "Tabernacle." Pages 267-304 in *The Book of Exodus: Composition, Reception, and Interpretation*. Edited by Thomas Dozeman, Craig A. Evans, and Joel N. Lohr. Vetus Testamentum Supplement 164. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Van den Eynde, S. "Keeping God's Sabbath אֵת and בְּרִית (Exod 31:12-17)." Pages 501-514 in *Studies in the Book of Exodus: Redaction - Reception - Interpretation*. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum theologicarum Lovaniensium 126. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- Van Seters, John. *The Life of Moses: The Yahwist as Historian in Exodus-Numbers*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

- Vermeulen, Jacques. "L'affaire du veau d'or [Exod 32-34]. Une clé pour la 'question deutéronomiste'?" *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft* 97 (1985): 1-23.
- Volz, Paul. "P ist kein Erzähler." Pages 135-142 in *Der Elohist als Erzähler, ein Irrweg der Pentateuchkritik?* Edited by P. Volz and W. Rudolph. Beihefte zum Zeitschrift für Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft 63. Gießen: Töpelmann, 1933.
- Wagenaar, Jan. "Passover and the First Day of the Festival of Unleavened Bread in the Priestly Festival Calendar." *Vetus Testamentum* 64.2 [2004]: 250-268.
- Wagner, Volker. "Zur Existenz des sogenannten 'Heiligkeitgesetzes.'" *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 86 (1974): 307-316.
- Warner, Meg. *And I Will Remember my Covenant with Abraham: The Holiness School in Genesis*. Th.D. Diss.; Melbourne College of Divinity, 2011.
- Warning, Wilfried. *Literary Artistry in Leviticus*. BIS 35. Leiden: Brill, 1999.
- Watts, James. "Aaron and the Golden Calf in the Rhetoric of the Pentateuch." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 130 (2011): 417-430.
- _____. *Reading Law: The Rhetorical Shaping of the Pentateuch*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Weimar, Peter. "Exod 12:1-14 und die priesterschriftliche Geschichtsdarstellung." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 107 (1995): 196-214.
- _____. "Zum Problem der Entstehungsgeschichte von Ex 12:1-14." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 107 (1995): 1-17.
- _____. *Studien zur Priesterschrift*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 56. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Weinfeld, Moshe. "Sabbath, Temple and the Enthronement of the Lord - The Problem of the *Sitz im Leben* of Genesis 1:1-2:3." Pages 501-512 in *Mélanges bibliques et orientaux en l'honneur de M. Henri Cazelles*. Edited by André Caquot and Mathias Delcor. *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 212. Kevelaer: Butzon&Bercker; Neukirchen-Vlyun: Neukirchener, 1981.
- Wellhausen, Julius. *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* 4th edition. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1963.
- _____. *Prolegomena zur Geschichte Israels*. 2nd edition. Berlin: G. Reimer, 1883.
- Wenham, Gordon. *The Book of Leviticus*. New International Commentary on the Old Testament. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979.
- de Wette, W.M.L. *Kritik der Israelischen Geschichte Erster Teil: Kritik der Mosaischen Geschichte*. Halle: Schimmelpfennig, 1807.
- Wöhrle, Jakob. *Fremdlinge im eigenen Land: Zur Entstehung und Intention der priesterlichen Passagen der Vätergeschichte*. Forschungen zur Religion und Literature des Alten und Neuen Testaments 246. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht, 2012.
- _____. "The Integrative Function of the Law of Circumcision." Pages 71-87 in *The Foreigner and the Law: Perspectives from the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by R. Achenbach, R. Albertz, and J. Wöhrle. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2011.
- Wurster, Paul. "Zur Charakteristik und Geschichte des Priesterkodex und Heiligkeitgesetzes." *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentlich Wissenschaft* 4 (1884): 112-133.

- Zenger, Erich. "Das priesters(schrift)liche Werk (P)." Pages 193-209 in *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*. Edited by E. Zenger et al. 8th edition. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 2008.
- _____. *Die Sinaitheophanie: Untersuchungen zum jahwistischen und elohistischen Geschichtswerk*. Forschungen Zur Bibel 3. Würzburg: Echter, 1971.
- Ziemer, Benjamin. *Abram-Abraham: Kompositionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zu Gen 14, 15, und 17*. Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft 35. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.
- _____. "Schöpfung, Heiligtum, und Sabbat in der priesterlichen Bundeskonzeption." Pages 39-58 in *Ex Oriente Lux: Studien zur Theologie des Alten Testaments. Festschrift für Rüdiger Lux zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Angelika Berjelson and Raik Heckl. ABG 39. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 2012.
- Zimmerli, Walther. "Sinaibund und Abrahambund: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Priesterschrift." Pages 205-216 in *Gottes Offenbarung: Gesammelte Aufsätze zum Alten Testament*. München: Kaiser Verlag, 1963.